

6

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York

---

CORNELL STUDIES  
IN  
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT,  
AND GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL

No. VII

**THE ATHENIAN SECRETARIES**

BY

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON, A.M.

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1898

649"

THE

ATHENIAN SECRETARIES

BY

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON, A.M.

FELLOW OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY

---

CORNELL STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, No. VII

---

COPYRIGHT, 1898,  
BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ITHACA, N. Y.  
PRESS OF ANDRUS & CHURCH,  
1898.

## PREFACE.

---

Between 1878 and the present time at least eight treatises devoted entirely to the Athenian Secretaries have been published. If we add articles in handbooks and dictionaries of classical antiquities in which statements of facts rather than proofs are furnished, the number must be doubled. The subject of this study is therefore an old, much-investigated one ; its point of view alone is new.

There were few annual offices at Athens not filled by boards of ten. There were fewer still filled by individuals. The secretaryships were such. Of the other single annual offices the names of the holders have with a few distinguished exceptions all been lost. It is, indeed, altogether owing to the fact that, in the case of the Secretaryships alone of their class, we know in large part the names and demes of their holders, that their study is of more than third-rate importance in Athenian Constitutional History. Knowing their demes we know their tribes, and as a result of the observation that the tribe of the psephismata secretary for any given year was determined by its position in the official order, something of value may have been derived from this study. Of this let the reader judge for himself.

During the fifth and fourth centuries B. C. the archons establish the years of the secretaries : during the third and second the psephismata secretaries will, hereafter, be our guides in fixing the years of the archons. To the list offered by me the names only of those archons have been admitted whose positions have been located or affected by the secretaries, and of these I am conscious that many will later have to be changed.

To Professor B. I. Wheeler of Cornell University for the suggestion on which this investigation was begun, and for his constant assistance and advice up to and through the reading and criticism of the manuscript and proof, I here acknowledge my very

great indebtedness. Through his kindness and that of Dr. A. Wilhelm of the Austrian Institute at Athens, I have been enabled to obtain early or more accurate readings of several inscriptions. I desire, too, to thank Professor G. P. Bristol of Cornell University for his services in reading the proof, and also Mr. F. O. Bates, Fellow of Cornell University, whose special knowledge of the Attic demes and tribes has been of much value to me.

ITHACA, N. Y., April 9, 1898.

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE
§ 1. The Ten Tribes and their Official Order,.....	1
§ 2. The Secretaries of the Senate and People as determined by References in the Literature,.....	6
§ 3. Γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς,.....	8
§ 4. Γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν,.....	9
§ 5. Secretaries mentioned in Titles and Official Headings,.....	12
§ 6. Names of Secretaries in charge of the Psephismata prior to 363-2 B.C.,.....	14
§ 7. Relations between Tribes in the Secretaryship and Tribes in the Prytany. Mode of Electing Secretary,.....	19
§ 8. Change from <i>Χειροτονία</i> to <i>Κλήρωσις</i> . The Significance of the Secretary's Name in the Titles and Official Headings of Decrees, .....	27
§ 9. Secretaries mentioned in the Preambles of Decrees between 364-3 B.C. and 322-1 B.C.,.....	32
§ 10. Official Order of the Tribes in the Secretaryship during the Fourth Century B.C.,.....	34
§ 11. Restorations, .....	38
§ 12. The Fifteen Years of Confusion between 322-1 B.C. and 307-6 B.C.,.....	40
§ 13. The Official Order of the Tribes in the Secretaryship during the last Three Centuries B.C.,.....	44
§ 14. Γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν. Γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου. Περί τὸ βῆμα, .....	63
§ 15. Γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους,.....	66
§ 16. Γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου,.....	66
§ 17. Γραμματεὺς πρυτάνεων. Γραμματεὺς βουλευτῶν, .....	70
§ 18. Γραμματεὺς τῶν ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ. Γραμματεὺς τῶν ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν,.....	70
Appendix A—The Tribes with their Respective Demes,.....	75
Appendix B—Bibliography, .....	77

st  
t  
l  
s  
g

## THE ATHENIAN SECRETARIES.

### § I. THE TEN TRIBES AND THEIR OFFICIAL ORDER.

Probably that which more than anything else determined the shape of the mechanism of Athenian government was the institution of the ten tribes. Before Kleisthenes' time there had been four tribes only, *Γελέοντες*, *Ὀπλητες*, *Ἀργαδεῖς* and *Αἰγικορεῖς*, so called from the four sons of Ion. From the little we can learn of them, they seem to have been local and social in character, and therefore different in kind from those with which we are familiar in later times. Kleisthenes in devising the ten tribes strove to make them unlike their predecessors, and probably succeeded. The Kleisthenean tribes were also different in kind from their subdivisions, the trittyes and demes. The demes were new creations of Kleisthenes; the trittyes had existed even before Solon's time. This difference consisted in the fact that the ten tribes did not have a place on the map of Attica, while the Ionic tribes, the trittyes and the demes did. The tribe had its agora, or meeting-place, but the men who assembled there might, and ordinarily did, come from several different sections of the country. A number of contiguous demes made a trittys, and a deme was a lot of land with the citizens who themselves, or whose ancestors, nominally or actually, dwelt on it. Each of the ten tribes had three trittyes, and each trittys a number of demes. Each tribe, trittys, and deme had its own constitution and officers. As the trittyes were by far the least important of these three divisions of the citizens of Athens, so were the ten tribes the most important; for we find that with very few exceptions all the state offices were filled by boards of ten or multiples of ten. The frequency of *δέκα* and *κατὰ φυλὰς* in Aristotle's Constitution of Athens is extremely significant. The political institutions were certainly based upon the decimal system; the religious institutions are inseparable from the political, and the military have the ten generals, the ten taxiarchs, the ten phylarchs, the ten divisions



of the citizen army etc., to show the plan upon which they were built.

Outside Attica also, the influence of the ten tribes was felt. If a colony was planted, each tribe had its representative on the board of land agents. If a Kleruchy was sent out, it preserved the tribal organization of the motherland : it was Athens in miniature. If new territory was acquired, an enclosure was reserved for the eponymoi of the tribes. If Athenians held offices in dependent states, the tribe was considered in their election just as in the case of offices at Athens. In fact, wherever Athenian influence prevailed, the form of government there in vogue owed its proportions to the tribal institutions of Athens.

Not only were the duties which the *δῆμος* could not personally perform ordinarily entrusted to boards of ten, but these boards of ten were made up of individuals chosen by lot, one from each of the ten tribes. The tribe determined the group of citizens eligible for a certain office ; the lot decided which of the group should hold it. Both served purely and simply as convenient and equitable means of distributing state honours and burdens. Neither is essentially democratic ; but as applied at Athens both were. The tribes became democratic institutions, when, by Kleisthenes' reforms, approximately all citizens were admitted to them. The lot became most democratic, when any citizen of Athens might be selected by it to hold any office.

It is obvious that for the distribution of offices filled by individuals not by boards—such as the secretaryships—an order of precedence among the tribes was desirable ; for so best was an equitable distribution possible. If the explanation, offered by H. Sidgwick (*Class. Rev.* 1894 p. 333 ff.) for the periodic anarchy which followed the legislation of Solon, be correct, and it is highly plausible, it follows immediately that there was such an order among the four Ionic tribes. What this might have been we can only conjecture. It may be found in the following passage from Eur. *Ion*, 1579–81.

Γελέων μὲν ἔσται πρῶτος· εἶτα δεύτερος . . .

Ὅπλητες Ἀργαδῆς τ' ἐμῆς τ' ἀπ' αἰγίδος

Ἐν φῦλον ἕξουσ' Αἰγικορῆς.

Accordingly the official order of the four Ionic phylai may have been (1) Γελέοντες, (2) Ὀπλητες, (3) Ἀργαυεῖς, (4) Αἰγικορεῖς.

However that may be, there can be no question whatsoever as to the existence of an official order of the ten tribes. As given in many inscriptional documents it is as follows: (1) Erechtheis, (2) Aigeis, (3) Pandionis, (4) Leontis, (5) Akamantis, (6) Oineis, (7) Kekropis, (8) Hippothontis, (9) Aiantis, (10) Antiochis. As a means of classifying the names of the citizens, this order was the nearest approach the Athenians made to our use of the letters of the alphabet. That it was more than a mere convenience in cataloguing has yet to be shown.

The names of the tribes are said by Aristotle to have been selected for them by the Pythian God from among the one hundred Archegetai. If it were not true that the ten tribes were the arbitrary creations of Kleisthenes, this might be understood to mean that the Athenians themselves did not know anything about the origin of the names. As it is, it is probably the correct explanation. Who the hundred Archegetai were, and what relation they bore, if any, to the hundred demes and the forty-two ἐπώνυμοι τῶν ἡλικιῶν, are questions still awaiting solution.

The origin of the official order is quite as uncertain. A. Mommsen (Phil. N. F., 1888, p. 449 ff.) tries to show that it sprang from the old Calendar of Festivals. According to his view, each of the ten eponymoi was worshipped in a certain season of the year, and each tribe managed the affairs of the state, through its representatives in the senate, during the period in which the festival of its eponymos was held. The guarantee for the observance of the official order was the sanctity of the Calendar of Festivals. When people became less observant of the worship of the heroes, the official order was thrust aside. The strongest objection to this view is that it is contrary to the tendency observable in the historic period. Although it is certain that the official order was never in any known period followed by the tribes in the prytany, yet, in other matters of a civil nature, the tendency is altogether in the direction of its broader use. Mommsen's view is based upon the assumption that the official order was followed in disposing the tribes in the prytany in the earliest

times. This is very unlikely. It must be admitted, however, that the employment of the lot in the election of civil officials is doubtful between 510 B.C. and 487 B.C. Aristotle tells us that in the latter year it was first used for the election of the archons. Previously, he says, they were elected by the people. Even if the official order did originate in the way conceived by Mommsen, it was not for long, if at all, perpetuated in that way. To me the origin of the official order seems incapable of settlement; but the institutions which demanded it, and preserved it, after it was once fixed, may, I think, be legitimately made a subject of enquiry.

The earliest reference to a fixed order of the tribes is found in connection with the military organization of the state. In the account given by Herodotus of the deliberations that took place immediately before the battle of Marathon, we are told that the ten generals—one from each tribe at that time—held office by turns, each for one day only, and that Miltiades waited till his lawful day came round before putting the troops in motion. It is not reasonable to suppose that an order of precedence was fixed by lot for each period of ten days throughout the year. In the arrangement of the prytanies in after times, to which the rotation of the generalship would present the closest analogy, we have reasons for believing that at least up to the thirtieth day of the prytany, the lot had not yet been cast to decide upon the next tribe to prytanize; so that we have herein no precedent on which to base the assumption that they fixed by lot, at the beginning of each year, the order in which the tribes were to hold the generalship, in each ten-day period throughout the year. Further, it being clear from Herodotus that there was a fixed order of succession in the generalship, we should naturally expect it to be the official order.

It also appears to me entirely likely that the *φυλαί* or *τάξεις* were arranged in battle according to the official order. At Marathon, Herodotus tells us, such was the case: *ἡγεομένων δὲ τούτου ἐξεδέκοντο ὡς ἀριθμείοντο αἱ φυλαί, ἐχόμεναι ἀλλήλων*. The imperfect seems to show that they were arranged in a customary order, *i. e.*, the official order. If the polemarch Kallimachos of Aphidna, who, Herodotus says, was in command of the whole army in

virtue of his office, took his position with his own tribe Aiantis, *i. e.*, had his tribe with him in the right wing, then Erechtheis, the first tribe, was placed on the left. In Plutarch, Aristid. V, we are told that Leontis and Antiochis, commanded respectively by Themistokles and Aristides, fought side by side in the centre. This clashes with the account given by Herodotus, and does not seem to me to deserve credence; for Plutarch, who lived in the first century after Christ and was a native of Boeotia, was acquainted only with the organization of mercenary troops, and could have had little knowledge of the citizen militia of Athens in the fifth century before Christ. The placing of Leontis and Antiochis side by side, would not jar with the order of things with which he was acquainted, and would add greatly to the dramatic effect of his narration.

An Athenian army was but an aggregate of ten tribes of citizen soldiers. The epehebes were divided for mess into ten divisions according to their tribes. The ten divisions of the cavalry were called *φυλαί*. When an army was put in the field, men of a certain age, drafted from each of the ten tribes, made up the ten regiments of which it was composed. To determine what individuals were included within the age limits set, the forty-two *ἐπώνυμοι τῶν ἡλικίων* were used. The *ἐπώνυμοι τῶν φυλῶν* were used to determine the regiments to which these individuals belonged. We know, then, that in drafting troops for service, in assigning their places to each soldier, in distributing the epehebes at mess, the tribe was primarily considered. The ten regiments were the ten tribes. The ten commanders were the ten tribal officers, and held supreme command by turns in a well known order of succession. On one occasion there is at least some evidence that the regiments stood side by side in the official order of the tribes. This establishes a probability in favor of the view that the order of the tribes was the order of the regiments, and, as far as I am aware, there is nothing that militates against it.

From time immemorial, we are told by Thucydides and Pausanias, there existed at Athens the custom of burying the citizens, who fell in battle, in the public burying ground of the Kerameikos. The dead of each tribe were buried separately, and over the graves

stelai were erected bearing the name and deme of each (στήλαι τὰ ὀνόματα καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἐκάστων λέγουσαι). Several of these stelai have come down to us, and on them the names are disposed according to the official order of the tribes. It is, indeed, in these lists that we first meet with the official order in the inscriptions. Those who fell at Marathon were buried according to their tribes (κατὰ φυλὰς), and stelai erected bearing their names; while, even before that event, burial in the public burial ground existed. The important point to be noticed is, that it was only in the case of the warriors who died in battle that the names were inscribed in the official order of the tribes. This strengthens the view as to the use of the official order to aid in marshalling the citizen army.

The military necessities would thus demand a fixed arrangement of the tribes, and the constant usage of the order, when fixed, would insure permanency to the organization: but why was the order such as it is? Perhaps Kleisthenes had the Pythian God arrange the tribes, as he had him name them. Perhaps the accidental arrangement of the statues of the eponymoi in the marketplace was adopted and so became fixed. The order was certainly so fixed for the burial lists of those who fell in battle, as early as 460 B. C., and seems to have been spasmodically adopted in later periods as the order of succession or rotation in the holding of civil offices.

## § 2. THE SECRETARIES OF THE SENATE AND PEOPLE AS DETERMINED BY REFERENCES IN THE LITERATURE.

The relation of the secretaries at Athens to the tribes, the rôle played by the official order in determining their distribution over the tribes, and the bearing of these considerations on the number, names, and duties of the secretaries, are the problems undertaken for solution in this study.

First in importance among the secretaries will come those of the senate and people. Literary references determine their number and functions, and guide us in our epigraphical investigations. Aristotle is the chief source of information outside the inscriptions, and he, in *Ath. Pol.* 54, 3-5, says;

Κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ γραμματεῖα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν καλούμενον, ὃς τῶν γραμμάτων τ' ἐστὶ κύριος, καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τὰ γινόμενα φυλάττει, καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα ἀντιγράφεται, καὶ παρακάθεται τῇ βουλῇ. πρότερον μὲν οὖν οὗτος ἦν χειροτονητός, καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους καὶ πιστοτάτους ἐχειροτόνουν· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς στήλαις πρὸς ταῖς συμμαχίαις καὶ προξενίαις καὶ πολιτείαις οὗτος ἀναγράφεται· νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληρωτός. κληροῦσι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ἕτερον, ὃς παρακάθεται τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ ἀντιγράφεται καὶ οὗτος πάντας. χειροτονεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ δῆμος γραμματεῖα τὸν ἀνιγνωσόμενον αὐτῷ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ οὗτος οὐδενός ἐστι κύριος ἄλλ' ἢ τοῦ ἀναγνώναι.

This is the fountain head of almost all our literary information on the subject of the secretaries of the senate and people. Pollux, VIII, 98, has paraphrased the passage thus :

Περὶ Γραμματέων.

Γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν· κληρωθεὶς ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς ἐπὶ τῷ γράμματι φυλάττειν καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα· καὶ ἕτερος ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους ὑπὸ τῆς βουλῆς χειροτονούμενος. ὁ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου αἰρεθεὶς γραμματεὺς ἀναγινώσκει τῷ τε δήμῳ καὶ τῇ βουλῇ.

Περὶ Ἀντιγραφείως.

Ἀντιγραφεὺς· πρότερον μὲν αἰρετός, αὐθις δὲ κληρωτός ἦν· καὶ πάντα ἀντιγράφετο παρακαθήμενος τῇ βουλῇ.

Pollux is wrong in saying that the secretary of the laws was elected by show of hands. He also makes duties for two officials, the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν and the ἀντιγραφεὺς, out of those given by Aristotle to the former alone.

The following is Harpokration's version of it (Dem. XVIII, p. 238, 14. ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς):—Γραμματεὺς· Δημοσθένης ὑπὲρ Κτησιφώντος. Ὁ γραμματεὺς πῶς τε καθίστατο καὶ τί ἔπραττεν, ὡς τῶν γραμμάτων τ' ἐστὶ κύριος καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τὰ γεγόμενα φυλάττει καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἀντιγράφεται καὶ παρακάθεται τῇ βουλῇ, δεδῆλωκεν Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν Ἀθηναίων πολιτείᾳ.

The value of the information, added by the publication in 1891 of the Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία referred to, is chiefly in that it reconciles the statements of Pollux and Harpokration. It compels us to accept the facts as given, and to apply our knowledge towards the elucidation of the inscriptional evidence.

We learn from Aristotle that there were three secretaries of the senate and assembly; we do not learn, however, the distinguish-

ing title of each. The γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρωτανείαν is, indeed, designated pretty clearly, and his duties would seemingly make his identification easy; but his name is not the only one connected with the ψηφίσματα, as will be seen shortly. The secretary for the laws is not given a title at all. The third secretary is simply denoted by his function, *i. e.*, to read documents to the senate and people.

### § 3. Γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς.

In the inscriptions we find that the secretary, who publishes the decrees of the senate and people in the earliest period, is designated thus: in the Nom. case, ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ τῆς βουλῆς, or ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς; in the Gen., τοῦ γραμματέως τῆς βουλῆς; in the Dat., τῷ γραμματεῖ τῆς βουλῆς; in the Acc., τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς, never τὸν γραμματέα τὸν τῆς βουλῆς, except in a doubting suggestion by Kirchhoff in C. I. A. iv 1, 22k, l. 7, p. 58, and in C. I. A. iv 1, 116p, p. 68, where it has likewise been restored by the editor. This designation appears, in the formula used to indicate the way in which the decree was to be disposed of, in the oldest inscriptions, and continues in use until 318-7 B. C. After this it is never found. Between 363 B. C. and 321 B. C., the title γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς is found about thirty times, and after 321 B. C., once, in 318-7 B. C. (C. I. A. iv 2, 231b, l. 67).

The chief business of the γραμματεὺς, seemingly, is to inscribe the decrees of the senate and people, on stone tablets, and set them up in the places specified. He has, further, to set up lists, at the bidding of the senate and assembly,—such as, the names of allies of Athens, the text of oaths and arrangements between the city and other states, the names of benefactors and πρόξενοι of the state, and the names of generals. He has to make copies of decrees already inscribed and to collate others. His duties are thus connected with the business of the senate and assembly in their civil and legislative capacity. He has no legal functions of any nature.

The formula by which his duties are normally specified, before Ol. 100, is as follows: τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τόδε ἀναγράψαι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ καταθεῖναι ἐμπόλει.

After 350 B. C. the formula is as follows: ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματεῖα τῆς βουλῆς ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει.

With the title γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς the name of the person holding the office is never given. In C. I. A. IV 2, 872b, l. 7, III, 1038, and 1045, the title γραμματεὺς βουλῆς is in all probability a shortened form of γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου,—that of a different official altogether.

#### § 4. Γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν.

But, as intimated earlier, we find an official with a different title attending to the ψηφίσματα, and performing duties very similar to those of the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς. Are they two distinct secretaries or is there only one with two titles? First as to the title;—in all the inscriptions, except five, this new secretary is designated by the name found in Aristotle ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν. These five are: (1) C. I. A. I, 61 (409–8 B. C.), (2) C. I. G. Sept., 4252 (332–1 B. C.), (3) C. I. A. II, 167, l. 31 (between 332 and 326 B. C.), (4) C. I. A. IV 2, 245e, and (5) C. I. A. I.

In C. I. A. I, 61, we find the phrase τοῦ[κατὰ πρυτανείαν γραμμα]τέως τῆς βουλῆς. In it [κατὰ πρυτανείαν γραμμα] has been restored by Koehler. C. Schaefer has proposed the alternative, τοῦ[βασιλέως μετὰ τοῦ γραμμα]τέως τῆς βουλῆς, and this has been received with favor by Sandys (Ath. Pol. 54, 3 note). In C. I. G. Sept., 4252, the formula is complete: ἀναγράφαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν γραμματεῖα. In the other three inscriptions cited, the phrase τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν γραμματεῖα has been restored either in whole or part. In (2), (3), (4), and (5), the order of the words only is reversed: no new idea is added. Such is not the case in C. I. A. I, 61, and it is not till 358 B. C., 50 years later, that the second reference to the secretary κατὰ πρυτανείαν is recorded. In C. I. A. II, 114; A. Wilhelm, Bericht<sup>1</sup>, p. 6; C. I. A. III, 1030, and 1038, we have the title γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν simply; but, as this occurs each time in a list of the different officials of the senate, none of which have the article its absence does not signify.

<sup>1</sup> Reprint apparently from the Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, philosoph.-hist. Klasse, dated 9th Dec., 1897.



The first reference to this official, leaving out of account C. I. A. I, 61, is either in 358-6 B. C. or 354-2 B. C. Here he is called *ὁ γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν*. Between the years 350 B. C. and 320 B. C., this title is found about twenty-five times; between 320 B. C. and 100 B. C. about one hundred times; between 100 B. C. and the birth of Christ about fifteen times, five of them being in one inscription, and afterwards three times, once between 166 A. D. and 169 A. D., once at about 175 A. D. and once in the year 209-10 A. D.

As to the duties of the *γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν*;—in C. I. A. I, 61, the secretary mentioned seems to have had charge of the law of Draco concerning murder. At any rate, the revisers of the laws (*ἀναγραφῆς τῶν νόμων*) are to receive the law from him, to inscribe it on a stone tablet, and set it down in front of the stoa of the king archon.

In C. I. A. II, 61 (358-6 B. C. or 354-2 B. C.), the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* and the other<sup>1</sup> secretaries in charge of the state documents are to arrange the treasures in the Chalkotheke according to the nationality of the donors, to register the number, and make transcripts of the lists so registered. When this is done, the secretary of the senate (*γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*)<sup>2</sup> is to inscribe the lists on a stone tablet and set it up in front of the Chalkotheke. The secretary of the senate is, further, to make transcripts (*ποιήσασθαι ἀντίγραφα ἐκ τῶν στηλῶν*) of the inscriptions that deal with the treasures of the Chalkotheke.

From this time on, the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* appears regularly with the duty of inscribing the decrees of the senate and people on stone tablets and setting them up in specified places. Lists also are set up by him, such as testimonials of *προξενίαι* of persons, patents of citizenship, names of certain officials, names of maidens who bore the peplos at the Panathenaic processions etc.

The regular formula for the ordinary duties of the *γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν* is: *ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ καὶ στήσαι ἐν—*.

<sup>1</sup> οἱ ἄλλοι γραμματεῖς οἱ ἐπὶ τοῖς δημοσίοις γράμμασιν.

<sup>2</sup> See Gustav Gilbert in Phil. 39, 1880, p. 136 f. for the mention of the two titles in the same inscription.

In direct connection with the title  $\delta$  γραμματεὺς  $\delta$  κατὰ πρυτανείαν, the name of the individual is found in four cases only. These are, (1) C. I. A. II, 114 (343-2 B. C.), where we have the name Κλεόστρατος Τιμοσθένους Αἰγυλιεύς; (2) A. Wilhelm, Bericht, p. 6 (335-4 B. C.), where the name Πρόξενος Πυλαγόρου Ἀχερδούσιος is directly given the title γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν; (3) C. I. A. III, 1030 (between 166-7 A. D. and 168-9 A. D.), in which we have Μουσαῖος Φυλάσιος; (4) C. I. A. III, 1038 (circa 175 A. D.), in which we find Εὐκαρπος Θεο.....

To sum up: we have found (1) that until the year 358-6 B. C. or 354-2 B. C. an official called  $\delta$  γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς superintends the publication of the ψηφίσματα of the senate and assembly and does their bidding in related matters, *e.g.*, in making copies of decrees previously posted up; (2) that, between 358-6 B. C. or 354-2 B. C. and 318-7 B. C., either two distinct secretaries with the same functions, or one secretary with two distinct titles performs these duties. In this latter period we find that the duties performed by the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς and the γραμματεὺς  $\delta$  κατὰ πρυτανείαν are the same,<sup>1</sup> and agree in their nature with those assigned by Aristotle to the γραμματεὺς  $\delta$  κατὰ πρυτανείαν, and by Harpokration to the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς (Dem. XVIII, p. 238, 14). Neither of them can be either of the other two secretaries mentioned in Aristotle Ath. Pol. 54. In several<sup>2</sup> cases the secretary is called simply  $\delta$  γραμματεὺς, a fact which points strongly to the existence of only one official. The formulae used to denote their duties are alike in both cases, and undergo like changes simultaneously. There are these reasons for considering them the same person under different titles, and the transition stage, between 358-6 B. C. or 354-2 B. C. and 318-7 B. C., during which the two titles are mentioned with about equal frequency, is quite natural, if we think of one name being superseded by the other, *i. e.*, γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς by γραμματεὺς  $\delta$  κατὰ πρυτανείαν.

<sup>1</sup> "Quae vero ratio adhibita sit in distribuendis decretis, etsi in rem inquisivi, perspicere non potui, licet suspiceris Athenienses consilio potius usos esse quam casu."—Penndorf, Leipz. Stud. XVIII, p. 146.

<sup>2</sup> C. I. A. IV 2, 54b, l. 43, 88b, l. 14, 104a, l. 30, 318c frg. d, l. 21; II, 39, Add., 66b.

§ 5. SECRETARIES MENTIONED IN TITLES AND OFFICIAL HEADINGS OF DECREES.

In the introductory part of the decrees passed by the Athenian senate and people, the name of a secretary is mentioned, and along with it, those of the tribe in the prytany when the decree was passed, of the chairman who put the motion, of the person who made the motion in the meeting, and, in some cases, of the archon eponymos for the year. To some decrees, also, there is affixed a title, usually written in large letters at the very top of the stone. This contains, in some cases, the names of the individuals, or states, affected by the decree, or the general subject of the decree; in other cases, with or without this, the name of the secretary, or archon, or both. The identity of the secretary, mentioned in large letters at the top of the decree, with the person, said in the ordinary heading to have been secretary at the time the decree was passed, is determined absolutely by the identity of the names in all the ordinary inscriptions that contain both. C. I. A. IV 2, 5d (399-8 B. C.) will serve to illustrate the ordinary title and heading :

1	Ἀριστοκράτης ἥρχε.	} Title.
2	Λυσίμαχος Κολωνῆθεν ἐγραμμάτενε.	
3	Ἀριστέον Αἰγιῶς.	
4	*Ἐδοξεν τῇ βουλῇ Πανδιον-	} Official heading.
5	ἰς ἐπρυτάνενε, Λυσίμαχος	
6	ἐγραμμάτενε, Κλέων ἐπεστ-	
7	άτει .....ων εἶπε Ἀριστέ-	
8	αν τὸν Ἀχαιὸν τὸν Αἰγιᾶ ἀνα-	} Decree.
9	γράψαι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς	
10	βουλῆς ἐν πόλῃ ἐν στήλῃ λ-	
11	ιθίνῃ πρόξενον καὶ εὐερ-	
12	γέτην αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκγόνους, ἀ-	
13	ναγράψαι δὲ αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν.-	
14	....., ἐπειδὴ εἰσι ἀνδ-	
15	ρες ἀγαθοὶ περὶ τὴν πόλιν	
16	τὴν Ἀθηναίων - - - -	

## OFFICIAL

e Athenian  
tioned, and  
the decree  
the person  
ases, of the  
so, there is  
very top of  
of the indi-  
general sub-  
thout this,  
he identity  
the top of  
ry heading  
assed, is de-  
all the ordi-  
5d (399-8  
heading :

heading.

For the sake of clearness, hereafter, inscriptions consisting of a decree of the senate and people passed prior to 368 B. C., will be divided as above. All before ἰδοξεν will be called the *title*. All between the title and the name of the mover of the decree will be called the *official heading*, and all after the name of the mover, the *decree*. In discussing decrees that belong after 368 B. C., all that precedes the decree proper will be called the *preamble*. Usually near the end of the decree, *e.g.*, in line 8 ff. of the inscription just cited, there are given the formulae quoted above as indicating the ordinary duties of the secretary in question. It is in these formulae that the two different titles, γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς and γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν are found.

It might, I think, have been taken for granted that the secretary, mentioned by name in the title and official heading, is the same one whose duties are stated in the body of the decree. The identity of the two in the period preceding 368 B. C. has never been disputed by anyone. Aristotle takes account of the omission of the name of the secretary in the title under the head of γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, and in C. I. A. II, 114 an official, whose name appears in the preamble of two inscriptions (C. I. A. IV 2, 114 b, 114 c), is called γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν. In the preamble of C. I. A. IV 2, 128 b A, the name of the secretary may with certainty be restored thus, Πρόξενος Πυλαγόρου Ἀχερδοῦσιος (see below § 11). To this same individual, in A. Wilhelm, Bericht, p. 6, is attached the title, γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν (see below § 10). This view is made quite certain by the decrees of the years 321-0 B. C., 320-9 B. C., and 319-8 B. C. There were during this period two officials dealing with decrees. Both are mentioned by name in the preamble. Upon one only, the ἀναγραφεὺς, is imposed the task of publishing the decrees. Had the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς, who between 358 B. C. and 318 B. C. had frequently to publish the decrees, been other than the one said in the preamble to have been secretary at the time the decree was passed, in all reason, we should have expected to find his name in the preamble also.

## § 6. SECRETARIES IN CHARGE OF PSEPHISMATA PRIOR TO 363-2 B. C.

The names of the secretaries found in the inscriptions of the period in which the title γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς alone is given, *i.e.*, roughly speaking before 363-2 B. C. are as follows :

<i>Tribe in Prytany</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Tribe of Secretary</i>
Aigeis		456-448 c. 454	Δι - - - οκλῆς Φι - · Ἀγνόδημος - [κ]λῆς [Εὐκ]λῆς - ? · Ὀΐάστειπος [· Ἀριστοκ]ράτης Αἰ . . . . . · ον . ιος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν Τιμοτέλ[ς] Ἀχαρνέ[ις] · Ἀρ[χέστ]ουτο[ς] - Πυ[μνουσιος]	I, 16. IV 1, 22g, p. 9. · Ἐφημέρις, 1897. IV 1, 22c, p. 8. IV 1, 22a, p. 6. II, 11. Wilh. Ber., p. 2. I, 21. IV 1, 22b, p. 8. I, 299. IV 1, 27b, p. 59. IV 1, 299a, p. 147. IV 1, 557, p. 125. I, 86. Wilh. Ber., p. 2.	Antiochis Oineis
Akamantis Leonitis ...ntis	I	449-446 444-439 444-431 444-436 440-9	- [Ἐρριά ?]δ[η][ς] Μνησίθεος Τιμόβ[λος] Αναφλύτι[ος] Μεταγένης Κριτιάδης Φυεινίου Ταυράσιος	I, 314. I, 32. I, 309. Penndorf, Leipz. Stud. XVIII. p. 132. I, 301, 315. I, 33, 179. IV 1, 33, 33a, p. 3, 300-302, p. 147.	{ Hippothontis Antiochis Antiochis Aigeis

Kekropis	I	435-4 C. 435-4	Μηριόθεος Τυμόβ[εος Αναφλάστι]ος	I, 32. I, 309. Pemndorf, Leipz. Stud. XVIII. p. 132. I, 301, 315.	Antiochis
Aiantis	I	434-3 433-2	Μεταγένης Κριτιάδης Φαινίου Τεθράσιος	I, 33, 179. IV 1, 33, 33a, p. 13, 300-302, p. 147.	Aigeis

<i>Tribe in Pnytan</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Tribe of Secretary</i>
Akamantis	I	433-2	Χαρίας	IV 1, 33, 33 a, p. 13.	{ Aigeis Pandionis
Antiochis		432-1	[Δ]ίστιμος[ς Φ]ηγα[εύς] ?	IV 1, 179a, p. 30 & p. 159.	
Akamantis		C. 430	Χαροιάδης	IV 1, 27c, p. 164.	
	I	429-8	... Λεύς	IV 1, 35c, p. 65.	
Erechtheis		429-8	Κ[α]λλίστρατος.....	I, 195.	Leontis
Hippothontis	I	428-7	Σκόπας	I, 40.	
Kekropis	2	426-5	Μεγακλειδης [Λευ]κανοεύς	I, 40, 176, 273.	
	I	426-5	.....ης	I, 40.	
Aigeis	I	425-4	Πλειωτίας	I, 37, 273.	
	4?	425-4	...ων	I, 37.	
		425-4	Πολέμαρχος	I, 39. IV 1, 39a, p. 141.	
Akamantis		424-3	Φαίνιππος Φρονίχου	Wilh. Ber., p. 2.	
	I	424-3	...ι.χος	I, 40. Thucy. IV, 118.	
Aigeis	I	423-2	Δημήτριος Κολλυτεύς	Hermes, 1896, 137f.	
	I	421-0	Πρέπης Εὐφύηρου	I, 273. I. 25-29. p. 147.	Aigeis
Hippothontis		421-0	Προκλῆς Ἀτάβου Εἰωνυμ[ε]ν[ς]	I, 273. I. 36-40, p. 147.	
Oineis		Before 420	.....	IV 1, 225k, p. 174. Mitth. 19, p. 163.	
	I	420-9	[Φα]ντοκλῆ[ς]	I, 45, 46.	Erechtheis
	I	419-8	Χαρίνο[ς]	IV 1, 46a, p. 14.	
.....is		420-413	.....	I, 47.	
	I	418-7	Νεοκλειδης (cf. Ne - I, 65.)	IV 1, 225k, p. 174.	
Pandionis		418-7	.....	IV 1, 71, p. 21.	
		418-7	Ἀριστοχ[σέ]ν[ος]	I, 180-183.	
				IV 1, 53a, p. 66.	

*Names of the Psephismata Secretaries.*

<i>Tribe in Prytany</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Tribe of Secretary</i>
...eis Hippothontis	1	417-6	.....	I, 180-183.	
	1	416-5	.....	I, 180-183.	
	1	415-4	...ιδης	I, 180-183.	
		414-3	...ιος (or in 419-8 B.C.)	IV 1, 53b, p. 166.	
		412-1	[Αἰ]σχάλο[ς]	II, 21. I, 69? Hermes, 1896, p. 141.	
		411-0	Δημόκος Ἀλωπεκῶθεν	Vit. Ant., p. 233, 76 West-ermann.	Antiochis?
Aiantis Oineis Leontis Hippothontis Erechtheis Kekropis Akamantis Antiochis .....is	1	410-9	Κλεγένης Ἀλαεΐς	I, 188. Andoc. I, 96.	{ Aigeis Kekropis
	3	410-9	Φίλιππος ... εὐδ -- Oi-	I, 58, 188.	
	6	410-9	Σιβηριτιάδ[ης]	I, 188. IV 1, 51, p. 15.	Erechtheis
	8	410-9	Δόβων [ἐκ] Κηδῶν	I, 59, 188.	
	9	410-9	...θ.ων	II, 128.	Aiantis Leontis
	1	409-8	Νικοφάνης Μαυραβάνος	I, 322.	
		409-8	Διώνητος Φρεαίριος	IV 1, 62b, p. 167.	Erechtheis?
		408-7	Εὐκλείδης	IV 1, 62a, p. 68	
		408-7	.....	IV 1, 553, p. 54	Hippothontis
		408-7	[Κλε]άρχος	I, 63.	
		407-6	[Δ]υσικλῆς	II, 22. Hermes, 1896, p. 141 n. 1.	
Kekropis		406-5	[Σ]ωτίων Ἐ[λευσί]νιος		
		405-4	Πολύμνιος Εὐωνυμείας	IV 2, 1b.	Erechtheis
Aigeis		Before 403	Στέφανος Θουκυδίδου	Athenaens. VI, p. 234 E.	Antiochis?
		"	-ύλο[ς]	I, 67.	
		"	Φι --	I, 84.	
		"	--ς	IV 1, 76b, p. 21.	
		"	--εὺς	IV 1, 116, p. 196.	

Tribe in Prytany	No.	Year B.C.	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe of Secretary
Kekropis	405-4	Before 403	Πολύμνος Εἰωνομένης	IV 2, 1b.	Erechtheis
Aigeis	"	"	Στέφανος Θουκυδίδου	Athenaeus, VI, p. 234 E.	Antiochis ?
	"	"	- ὑλικοφ[ς]	I, 67.	
	"	"	Φι - -	I, 84.	
	"	"	- - - εἰς	IV 1, 76b, p. 21.	
				IV 1, 116°, p. 196.	
Erechtheis		Before 403	Ἴερο - - Ἀλωπ[εσθῆν]	IV 1, 116°, p. 197.	Antiochis
Pandionis	"	"	... ος	IV 1, 116°, p. 69.	
Oineis	403-2	"	Νε - - (cf. 420-413 B.C.)	I, 65.	
Kekropis	403-2	"	Κηφισοφών Παιωνίης	II, 1b, 1. 20. IV 2, 1b, 1. 1.	Pandionis
	c. 403-2	"	Ἀγυρίμης Κ[ολ]υτρεῖς	IV 2, 1b, 1. 41. IV 2, 1d.	Aigeis
	c. 423	"	Δεξιθέος	II, 3, 5.	
	399-8	"	Σ . . . . .	IV 2, 5c.	
Pandionis			Ἀντίμαχος [Κο]λωρήθεν	II, 1c, 1. 31.	{ Aigeis Leontis Kekropis
Pandionis	394-3		Πλάτων Νικοχάρους Φλυεῖ[ς]	IV 2, 5d.	
Akamantis	394-3		Χελωνίων Θεογ . . . . .	II, 8.	
	c. 394		Ἀρ[ιστοκράτης Διο]χίνου Κεφ[αλήθεν	IV 2, 7b.	
	c. 394		Ἀρχικλῆς	IV 2, 25.	
	c. 394		Χαριόδημος Θεοτέλους Λαμπιτρεῖς	IV 2, 11c.	
Kekropis	388-7		Τελ[σίως]	IV 2, 11d.	Erechtheis
	387-6		... . . . . . ὠδης	I. G. I. Mar. Aeg. I, 977.	
			Παραμυθός Φαλάγγιον Ἐρχεῖς	II, 13. IV 2, 13.	Aigeis
			[Ν]έω[ν Ἀ]λ[α]ίς	II Add., 14b, Nov. Add., p. 423. IV 2, 14b.	{ Aigeis Kekropis
Leontis	386-5		Φαλάξε[ος]	IV 2, 14c.	
Hippothontis	385-4		Ἀριστοτέλης Εὐφελήγρον [Α]λ[α]ριεῖς	IV 2, 14d.	Oineis
Pandionis	378-7		Καλλίβιος Κηφισοφώντος Παιωνίης	II Add., 17b	Pandionis
	c. 378-7		Καλ[λ] . . . . . Ἀλω[πεκρήθεν	II, 17	Antiochis
	Before 376		Εὐδράμιον Ἀχερδοσίως	IV 2, 18b	Hippothontis
	"	"	[Υπερβ]ολος	II, 23.	
Aiantis	"	"	- κρ[α]της	II, 24.	
. . . . is	"	"	Ἀμφικράτης	II, 25.	
	"	"	Ἀμεινίως . . . . . [Σ]φήττιω[ς]	II, 26.	Akamantis
				II, 27, 28.	



<i>Tribe in Prytany</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Tribe of Secretary</i>
Erechtheis		Before 376	Π[ι]στράγεος	II, 29.	Erechtheis
..... is		"	.....ο]ς Δημοφ[ι]λου Φ[ι]ηρούσιος	II, 30.	
Kekropis		"	.....	II, 31.	
		"	.....ς Ἐροφ[ιδίης]	IV 2, 31b.	
		"	...ξ]νο[ς Δ]ημανέτου [Θορ]κίος	IV 2, 33b.	{ Hippothontis Antiochis
		"	[Φ]ιλοκλῆς Ω.....	II, 49.	Akamantis
Antiochis	2	375-4	[Φυ]λακος Οἰναῖος	IV 2, 49c.	
Antiochis	2	375-4	Θουδιάτης Διομειεύς	IV 2, 49c.	{ Aiantis Hippothontis
Akamantis		373-2	Ἐ[ξ]η[κ].....πι[λ].....ω] Ἀζηνιέ[ο]ς	IV 2, 50b.	Aigeis
Erechtheis		369-8	Ἀριστείδης Στεφάνω Κυδαθηναίος	II, 51.	Hippothontis
Leontis		369-8	Μόσχος Θεοτίου Κυδαθηναίος	Ditt. Syll. I, 71.	Pandionis
Aiantis		368-7	Μόσχος Θεοτίου Κυδαθηναίος	II, 50. Add., 52c. IV 2, 50.	Pandionis
Kekropis	7	368-7	Μηριόβουλο[ς].....	II Add., 52b.	
Erechtheis	1	368-7	- Παιονιδ[ης] ?	IV 2, 73b.	Leontis
- ntis		c. 370	- ] Δημανέτ[ο]ν	II, 53. (cf. IV 2, 33b)	
Erechtheis	5	366-5	.....εύς	II, 73.	
Leontis		Before 363	..... Οἰ[ν]αῖος	II, 73.	{ Aiantis Hippothontis
Erechtheis		"	Κ[υδ]ήνηρ Κυδῆρη[ο]ρος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν	IV 2, 73d.	Antiochis
		"	- δροκλ -	IV 2, 73e.	
		"	Δωρ.....	IV 2, 73f.	
Hippothontis		"	Κηφ - - εὐς	IV 2, 74b.	
Akamantis		"	[Φ]οῖνον [Λ]εὺ[κο]νοεὶς	II, 76.	
		"	-ς Ἐ[τε] -	II, 79.	
		"	- ]σιόν	II, 80.	
		"	- Γλαυκίππου Ἀθηναίος	II, 81.	
Hippothontis		"	[Ν]ικόξενος Νικοκλέους Χολαργός	II, 82.	Antiochis
		"	Σμικελθός Χα[ρί]νου Ἀχαρνέ[υ]ς	IV 2, 85b.	Leontis
		"	- κλει -	II, 104.	Oineis
Pandionis		"	- φώντος	II, 78.	

§ 7. RELATIONS BETWEEN TRIBES IN THE SECRETARYSHIP AND TRIBES IN THE PRYTANY. MODE OF ELECTING SECRETARY.

It can be seen that, at least as late as the year 368-7 B.C., the secretary changed with the prytany. There were thus, in all probability, ten secretaries in the year, one from each of the ten tribes. Moreover, the tribe of the secretary and the tribe for which he was secretary were never the same. This is shown by the following cases in which we know both.

TRIBES OF SECRETARIES AND TRIBES FOR WHICH THEY WERE SECRETARIES TABULATED.

Year B.C.	Tribes of Secretary	Name and Deme of Secretary	Tribes in Prytany
444-31	Oineis	Τιμοτέλης Ἀχαρνέως	Kekropis
433-2	Aigeis	Κριτιάδης Φαινίου Ταθράσιος	Aiantis ?
426-5	Leontis	Μεγακλείδης Λευκονοειῦς	Hippothontis
421-20	Erechtheis	Προκλῆς Ἀτάρβου Εὔωνμνέως	Hippothontis
410-9	{ Aigeis Kekropis	Κλειγένης Ἀλκιδέως	Aiantis
410-9	Erechtheis	Δόβων ἐκ Κηδῶν	Hippothontis
409-8	Aiantis	Νικοφάνης Μαυρωθῆνιος	Kekropis
409-8	Leontis	Διόγνητος Φρεάρριος	Akamantis
405-4	Erechtheis	Πολύμνιος Εὔωνμνέως	Kekropis
403-2	Pandionis	Κηφισοφῶν Παιωνιέως	Erechtheis
403-2	Aigeis	Ἀγύρριος Κολλυτεύς	Pandionis
399-8	{ Aigeis Leontis Antiochis	Λυσίμαχος Κολωνήθεν	Pandionis
394-3	Kekropis	Πλάτων Νικοχάρους Θλυεύς	Pandionis
394-3	Akamantis	Ἀριστοκράτης Αἰσχίνου Κεφαλῆθεν	Aigeis
c. 394	Erechtheis	Χαρίδημος Θεοτέλους Λιμπτρεύς	Hippothontis
387-6	Aigeis	Παράμνθος Φιλάγρον Ἐρχιεύς	Kekropis
378-7	Oineis	Ἀριστοτέλης Εὐφιλήτου Ἀχαρνέως	Leontis
378-7	Pandionis	Καλλίβιος Κηφισοφῶντος Παιωνιέως	Hippothontis
a. 376	Hippothontis	Εὐδράμων Ἀχερδούσιος	Pandionis
375-4	{ Aiantis Hippothontis	Φύλακος Οἰναῖος	Antiochis
373-2	Aigeis	Θουδαίτης Διομειεύς	Akamantis
369-8	Hippothontis	Ἐξεκ . . . παῖ . . . ὦ Ἀζηριεύς	Erechtheis
369-8	Pandionis	Ἀριστείδης Στεφένω Κυδαθηναίως	Leontis
368-7	Pandionis	Μόσχος Θεσσίου Κυδαθηναίως	Aiantis
a. 363	Oineis	Σμικυθός Χαρίνον Ἀχαρνέως	Hippothontis
"	{ Aiantis Hippothontis	. . . . . Οἰναῖος	Leontis
"	Leontis	Φρόνων Λευκονοεύς	Akamantis
"	Antiochis	Κυδῆγῳρ Κυδῆγορος Ἀλωπεκῆθεν	Erechtheis

Antiochis  
Leontis  
Oineis

II, 79.  
II, 80.  
II, 81.  
II, 82.  
IV 2, 85b.  
II, 104.  
II, 78.

- ἑ[τε]-  
- ἑ[τε]-  
- ἑ[τε]-  
- ἑ[τε]-  
[N]ικα[ρ]ίας Νικοκλέους Χολλιδῶν  
Σμικυθός Χα[ρ]ίνον Ἀχαρνέ[ως]  
- κλει -  
- φῶντος

Hippothontis

Pandionis

There are two apparent exceptions, Vit. Ant., p. 233, 76, Westermann, and C. I. A. IV 2, 73b; for the former see Hille, Leipz. Stud. I, 1878, p. 213, and for the latter see Julius Penndorf, Leipz. Stud. XVIII, 1897, p. 114, note 6.

One can hardly believe that the lot pure and simple decided the order of the tribes, in holding either one of the offices without relation to the other; for, in that case, it is highly improbable that no instance should have been handed down to us in which the secretary belonged to the prytanizing tribe. We are, accordingly, justified in suspecting that the order of the tribes in the matter of secretary representation is determinable in terms of the order of the tribes in the prytany.

We have direct statements in the inscriptions and literature to the effect that the order of the tribes in the prytany was decided by lot. Thus in C. I. A. II, 312, we read:

τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις οἱ ἂν [π]ρῶτον λάχωσιν πρυτανεύειν δ[ο]ῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψήφον εἰς [τ]ῇμπρώτην ἐκκλησίαν; and in Aristotle Ath. Pol. 43: πρυτανεύει δ' ἐν μέρει τῶν φυλῶν ἐκάστη καθ' ὅτι ἂν λάχωσιν, αἱ μὲν πρῶται τέτταρες ἕξ καὶ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας ἐκάστη, αἱ δὲ ἕξ αἱ ὕστεραι πέντε καὶ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας ἐκάστη.

These statements, however, might be interpreted to mean that the tribe to sit first was fixed by lot and the others followed in the official order; but an examination of the inscriptions shows plainly enough that the tribes in the prytany, at least during the fifth, fourth, third and second centuries before Christ, did not have any relation to the official order at all.

It has been commonly believed that the order of the tribes in the prytany was fixed by lot at the beginning of the year. In an article on the 'Attic Civil and Sacred Years,' published in the Journal of Philology for 1895-6, Vol. 24, p. 76, T. Nicklin incidentally suggests that it may have been at the end of each prytany that the tribe to sit next was determined. This view I think correct and by a comparison of the following passages (all I can find bearing on the matter) will attempt to prove it to be so.

C. I. A. I, 37. ἐχ[σενε]γκέτω δὲ ταῦτα ἐς [τὸν] δῆμον [ἢ Αἰγῆ] ἐς π[ρ]οῦτα[νεί]α ἐπάναγκες ἐπει[δὲν] . . . . . ] στρα . . . ἐς τρίτην ἡμέραν [πρῶτ]ον μετ[ὰ τὰ ἱε]ρά.

This reading, given by a new fragment published by U. Koehler, in *Hermes*, 1896, p. 146, removes any difficulty that might be connected with the reading in the C.I.A.

C.I.A. I, 40. ἐπειδὴν ἐσέλ[θη ἢ π]ρυ[ταν]εῖα ἢ δευ[τέρα]. This is a compound decree: the second decree was passed during the second prytany, Kekropis, and dealt with the question transferred to it by the first prytany. Had it not been customary for the second prytany to be unknown during the term of office of the first prytany, it is strange that δευτέρα was not replaced by Κεκροπίς. That the secretary who posted up the decree felt no scruples in regard to changing a matter of phraseology to suit the fashion of the year in which he held office, may be ascertained from C.I.A. IV 2, 1b, in which it is to be noticed that the deme of the ἐπιστάτης was added to the decree by the secretary who had it posted up; for in this year alone before 378-7 B.C. was it customary to give the deme of this officer. On the other hand, that the decree he posted up was written out when passed and copied when inscribed on the stone, is clear from the same inscription; for in it the Hellenotamiai, although in 403-2 B.C. they no longer existed, are required to give, indeed, are supposed to have given, the money to pay for the setting up of the stone.

C.I.A. II, 12. [δ]οῦναι δὲ τῇ[ν] ψ[ή]φον τοὺς πρυτάνεις τοὺς μετὰ [τὴν] Ἐρεχθίδ[α] πρυτανεύοντας ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκκ[λη]σίᾳ περὶ τούτων - -]

C.I.A. II, 54. [ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκ[α]μαντίδος δευτέρα[ς] πρυτανείας]. - - - [τρι]ακóστη τῆς πρυτ[αν]είας. - - - τὴν δὲ ψῆφον δοῦναι περ[ὶ] αὐτοῦ τοὺς πρυτάνεις τοὺς [μετὰ] τὴν Ἀκαμαντίδα πρυταν[εύ]οντας ἐν τῇ[ν] πρώτῃ ἐκκ[λη]σίᾳ.

C.I.A. IV 2, 229c. τοὺς [δὲ] πρυτάνεις τοὺς μετὰ τὴν Ἀντιο[χ]ίδα πρυτανεύοντας δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκ[λη]σίαν.

C.I.A. II, 243. τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις τοὺς τὴν εἰσιούσαν πρυτανείαν πρυτανεύοντας δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον τῷ δήμῳ εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκ[λη]σίαν.

C.I.A. IV 2, 252e. [καὶ δοῦναι] περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον τοὺς πρυτάνει[ς] οἱ ἂν τυγχάνω[σι] πρυτανεύοντες μετ[ὰ] τῇ[ν] Οἰνη[ίδα] φυλήν, κατ[ὰ] τὸν νόμον.

C.I.A. II, 273. [τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις τοὺς τῇ[ν] εἰσιούσῃ πρυτανείᾳ] πρυτανεύοντας δοῦναι τῇ ψῆφῳ τῷ δήμῳ εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκ[λη]σίαν.

C.I.A. IV 2, 273C. [περὶ δὲ τῶν δωρεῶν δοῦναι τῇ]ν ψῆφ[ον τοὺς]  
[πρυτάνεις τοὺς τὴν εἰσιούσαν πρυ]ταν[εῖαν πρυτανεύοντας].

C.I.A. II, 309. το[ὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις οἱ ἂν τυγ]χάνωσιν πρυτανεύοντ[ες]  
[δοῦναι τὴν ψῆφον περὶ τῇ]ς δωρεᾶς ἐπειδὰν ἐπικν[ρωθῇ, εἰσαγαγεῖν δὲ]  
[τὴν δ]οκιμασίαν τοὺς θεσμ[οθέτας εἰς τὸ πρῶτον δικαστ]ήριον κατὰ τοὺς  
νόμο[υς].

C.I.A. II, 312. [Ἐ]πὶ Διοτίμου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ τ[ῆς II]α(ν)διονίδος  
δ[ω]δεκάτης πρυ[τα]νείας - - - . Σκιροφοριῶνος ἔκτει [μ]ετ'εἰκ[ά]δας,  
πέμπτει καὶ ε(ι)κοστ[ε]ῖ τῆς πρυτανείας - - - . τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις οἱ ἂν  
[π]ρῶτον λάχωσιν πρυτανεύειν δ[ο]ῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον εἰς [τ]ῆμ-  
πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν.

C.I.A. II, 119. [ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δ]ὲ αὐτοῦ - - [τοῦ]ς πρυτάν[εις οἷ]τινες  
[ἂν λά]χωσιν ἄ[εἰ ὅπως ἂν αὐτῷ σ]υνπ[ρ]άτ[ωσι οὗ ἂν δέ]χται.

If we compare these with the formulae used to convey instructions to the proedroi, whom we know to have been elected by lot just before assuming office, the inference suggested above seems to me to be forced upon us.

C.I.A. II, 318. - - - [ἀγαθεὶ τύχει δεδόχθαι τῇ βουλῇ] τοὺς προ-  
έδρο[ους οἱ ἂν λάχωσιν προεδρεύειν ἐν τῷ]ι δήμῳ εἰς τὴν [ἐπιούσαν ἐκκλησίαν]  
[ὅταν ἐξήκ]ωσιν αἱ ἐκ τοῦ ν[όμου] ἡμέραι χρηματίζειν περὶ τούτων, γνώμην  
δὲ ξυμ[βάλλεσθαι τῆς βουλῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον]ν ὅτι δοκεῖ τεῖ β[ουλεῖ] ἐπαινέσαι  
[Στρώμβιχον καὶ στ]εφανῶσαι χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ ἀπὸ - δραχμῶν ἀρετῇ]ς  
ἔνεκα καὶ φ[ιλοτιμίας τῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον]· εἶναι δ]ὲ αὐτὸν Ἀθην[αῖον καὶ τοὺς]  
[ἐκγόνους αὐτοῦ καὶ γρά]ψαισθαι φυλῇ[ς καὶ δήμου καὶ φρατρίας ἧς ἂν βούλ-]  
[ηται] κατὰ τὸν νό[μον, τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις δοῦναι περὶ αὐ]τοῦ τὴν ψῆφ[ον]  
[εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν, τοὺς δὲ θεσ]μοθέτ[ας εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτῷ τὴν]  
[δοκιμασίαν τῆς δωρεᾶ]ς [ὅταν πρῶτον - - - .

In this resolution of the senate, it seems to me that it would be straining the passage very much, to make τοὺς πρυτάνεις refer to any other prytanes than those in office at the time.

So in C.I.A. IV 2, 231b. Ἐπὶ Κηφισοδώρου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ [τῆς . . .]  
[. . . . . π]ε[ρὶ] νπτης πρυτανείας, ἡ [Εὐ]κλ[ῆς II]ν[υθοδώρου Ἀλωπεκῆθε]ν  
ἐγραμμάτευεν· Ποσιδεῶνο[ς] ἐ[κ]τη ἐπὶ δέκα, δευτέρ[η] καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῆς πρυτα-  
νεεί[ας] - - - . [δοῦναι δὲ τὴν ψῆ]φον τῷ δήμῳ περὶ τῆς πολιτε[ίας τοὺς]  
[πρυτάνεις τ]ῆς Πανδιονίδος ε[ἰ]ς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλη[σίαν κατὰ τὸν] νόμον.

Before commenting on this decree, further than to state that it

and all those quoted above, with the exception of C.I.A. I, 37 and 40, refer to donations of citizenship, I wish to cite (Dem.) 59, p. 1375.

πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ νόμος ἐστὶ τῷ δήμῳ κείμενος μὴ ἐξείναι ποιήσασθαι Ἀθηναίων ὃν ἂν μὴ δι' ἀνδραγαθίαν εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων ἄξιον ἢ γενέσθαι πολίτην. ἔπειτ' ἐπειδὴν πεισθῇ ὁ δῆμος καὶ δῶ τὴν δωρεάν, οὐκ ἐξ κυρίαν γενέσθαι τὴν ποιήσιν, ἔαν μὴ τῇ ψήφῳ εἰς τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἐκκλησίαν ὑπερεξακισχίλιοι Ἀθηναίων ψηφίσωνται κρύβδην ψηφιζόμενοι. τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις κελεύει τιθέναι τοὺς καδίσκους ὁ νόμος καὶ τὴν ψήφον διδόναι προσιόντι τῷ δήμῳ, πρὶν τοὺς ξένους εἰσιέναι καὶ τὰ γέρρα ἀναιρεῖν, ἵνα κύριος ὢν αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ ἕκαστος σκοπῇται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄντινα μέλλει πολίτην ποιήσασθαι, εἰ ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς δωρεᾶς ὁ μέλλων λήψεσθαι.

From this it is evident that τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλησίαν is identical with τὴν ἐπιούσαν ἐκκλησίαν. This being the case, we have no option but to restore Πανδιονίδος in the lacuna in the preamble of C.I.A. IV 2, 231b; for there were still thirteen days of the prytany to elapse, and during this period, even if no special convocation of the ekklesia was held, one of the four regular meetings mentioned by Aristotle must have taken place. Koehler, however, restores Ἀκαμαντίδος, seemingly for no other reason than that Πανδιονίς is mentioned farther down in the decree.

It is obvious that the meeting at which the people were to vote by ballot must often have been held before the term of the prytany, in which the matter was first considered, had expired. To cover these cases the following formula was used.

C.I.A. II, 108. [καὶ δοῦναι τὴν] ψήφον περὶ αὐτοῦ τοὺς πρυτάνεις ἐν τῇ [πρώτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ].

C.I.A. II Add., 115b. τοὺς δὲ πρ[υτ]άνει[ς] δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν [ψήφον] τῷ [δ]ήμῳ εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλ[ησ]ίαν.

C.I.A. II, 154. [τοὺς πρυτάνεις - - δοῦναι περὶ] αὐτοῦ [τὴν ψήφον τῷ] [δῆμῳ εἰς τὴν πρώτην] ἐκκλ[ησ]ίαν.

C.I.A. II, 187. [τοὺς δὲ πρυτάν]εις τῆς Ἰπποθ[ωντίδος] δοῦναι περὶ [αὐτοῦ τ]ῇ[ν] ψήφον εἰς τ[ὴν] πρώτην ἐκκλ[ησ]ίαν.

C.I.A. II, 223. [δοῦναι - - τὴν ψήφον τοῦ]ς πρυτάνει[ς - - εἰς] τὴν ἐπι[ούσαν] ἐκκλ[ησ]ίαν.

C.I.A. II, 228. τοὺς δ[ὲ] πρυτάνεις τῆς 'Α]ντιοχίδος δοῦνα[ι περὶ αὐτοῦ]  
[τῷ δῆ]μῳ τὴν ψῆφον εἰ[ς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλη]σίαν.

C.I.A. II, 229. [τοὺς πρυτάνεις - δοῦναι - περὶ αὐτῶ]ν τὴν [ψῆφον εἰς]  
[τὴν πρώτην ἐκ]κλησίαν.

C.I.A. II, 230. [τοὺς δὲ πρ]υτάνει[ς τῆς 'Ιπποθωντίδος δοῦναι περ]ὶ  
αὐτοῦ τὴν ψῆφον εἰς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλη]σίαν[ν].

It is made probable by the preamble that Hippothontis was fourth in the prytany in this year (334-3 B.C.). The dating of C.I.A. II, 739 is altogether too uncertain to present any obstacle.

C.I.A. II, 272. τοὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις τῆς 'Ιπ[πο]θωντίδος δοῦναι περὶ  
αὐτοῦ τὴν [ψ]ῆφον τῷ δήμῳ εἰσσεῖν πρώτην ἐκκλη]σίαν.

C.I.A. II Add., 273b. τοὺς δὲ [πρυτάνεις δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ τὴ]ν  
ψῆφον εἰ[ς τὴν πρώτην ἐκκλη]σίαν[ν] - - - .

C.I.A. II, 320. τοὺς δ[ὲ] πρυτάνεις τοὺς πρυτ[ανεύ]ον[τας] δοῦ[ν]α[ι]  
[π]ερὶ αὐτ[οῦ] τὴν ψῆφον[ν] - - - .

C.I.A. IV 2, 366b. δοῦναι δὲ π[ερὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν] ψῆφον τοὺς πρυτάνεις  
ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκκλησί]ᾳ.

See also C.I.A. IV 2, 229d, l. 15 ; II, 288, 300 ; IV 2, 300b ; II, 318, 361, 397, 401.

C.I.A. II, 51 might seem to present a difficulty, but, in reality, is strongly confirmatory. The preamble runs as follows :

[ 'Επὶ Λ]υ[σι]στράτου ἄρχοντος ἐπὶ [τῆς . . . ] -  
[ . . . ἰδ]ος δεκάτης πρυτανε[ί]ας [ῆ] 'Ε[ξ]ῆ[κ] -  
[ . . . πα]ύ[ω] 'Αζηνιεύ[ς] ἐγραμμάτ[ει]νε -  
[ν τῶν προέδρων] ἐ[πε]ψή[φισ]ε Εὐάγ[γ]ελος - - ?  
(corona) (corona)

[ . . . ἰ]διος εἶπεν ὡν οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ  
[παρὰ] Διονυσίου ἥκον[τες] λέγουσι[ν], δεδ[ό]χ[η]  
[θαι τῇ] βουλῇ. - - - [τ]  
[οὺς δὲ πρυτάνεις τού]ς [τῆς 'Ε]ρ[ε]χθίδος δο]  
[ῦναι τὴν ψῆφον περὶ] αὐτοῦ - - - .

Erechtheis in the second last line is due to Fauvel, who read *p* on the stone, and this is accepted by Koehler. It must be noticed that there is one space too few in the preamble to allow us to restore 'Ερεχθίδος. Nevertheless, it should be restored ; for in the

preamble as given in the Corpus there are but thirty letters, while in the rest of the decree there are thirty-one, though the whole inscription is written *στοιχηδόν*. If all the lines had an equal number of letters, Erechtheis would exactly fit the lacuna. Further, the decree was passed in the last prytany of the year. It is clear from C.I.A. II, 312 (see p. 22) that, during this prytany, the lot had not yet been cast to determine the tribe to sit first in the following year. The Pseudo-Demosthenes states that the vote by ballot was to be taken in regard to the donation of citizenship at the 'coming meeting of the people.' This would be utterly impossible were the prytanes of Erechtheis, who are required to see that this is done, other than those in the prytany at the time; for the first prytany of the following year (368-7 B.C.) was not Erechtheis, but Kekropis (C.I.A. II Add., 52b). I, therefore, have no hesitation in restoring 'Ερεχθίδος in the preamble of this decree.

In a decree published in *Hermes*, 1896, p. 138, and passed in the prytany of Akamantis of the year 424-3 B.C., there is found the following :

[καὶ δοῦναι Πο]ταμοδώρῳ πεντακοσίας δρ[αχμὰς δωρεῖαν ἐκ δημοσίου] ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀκαμαντίδος ἐντ[ὸς . . . . . ἡμερῶν, οἱ δὲ πρυ]τάνεις ἐπιμεληθέντων [ὅπως ἂν παρασχῶσιν οἱ κωλακ]ρέται · ταῦτα μὲν τῇμ[βουλῇν ψηφίσασθαι, εἰ δὲ τι δέη]ται Ποταμόδωρος, ἢ[Ἀκαμαντὶς πρυτανείᾳ ποιησάτω] πρόσοδον αὐτῷ ἐν [τῇ ἐκκλησί]ᾳ [πρῶτον μεθ' ἱερά].

In this inscription, although the tribe Akamantis is in the prytany at the time the instructions are given and are to be carried out, it is mentioned by name, not simply referred to as "οἱ πρυτάνεις."

C.I.A. I, 31B has Φαντοκλέ[α] δὲ προσαγαγὲν τὴν Ἐ[ρ]εχθείδα πρυτανεία[ν] πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν ἐν τῇ[ι] πρότει ἔδραι. In this there is an additional reason for specifying the prytany by name, in that Phantokles, whose interest was presumably in the colony which was being sent to Brea, would wish the tribes in the prytany at the time he was speaking to introduce him to the senate, that the thirty days, open for making arrangements, might not elapse before he got a chance to explain his plans.



It seems to me, therefore, that the speaker in the senate or assembly did not know the name of the tribe to succeed the one sitting in the prytany at the time he was speaking. Whenever the name of a tribe, instructed to perform some duty in the future, is mentioned, it is the name of the one in office at the time the instructions are given, unless they are given during the ninth prytany, when of course, the tribe to sit tenth being known, its name might be given. In the light of these facts we must explain the observation, that the tribe from which the secretary was chosen was never the same as that in the prytany during his term of office. If we look at the question from the point of view of the official who drew from the urn the ballots, by which, in each case, the tribe to sit in the prytany, and the tribe to be represented in the secretaryship next, were to be determined, we can understand the process most clearly. Let us suppose Aiantis to have been drawn for the first section of the prytany year, and one of the other nine, say Erechtheis, for the first secretaryship. Erechtheis would then proceed to elect by show of hands an individual to hold the office. For the second position in the prytany the lot fixed upon Aigeis, let us suppose. Of course, no ballot for Aiantis was put in the urn. The secretary for Aigeis would necessarily be chosen by one of eight tribes alone, unless we had supposed Erechtheis to have been the one drawn for the second place in the prytany. In this way, when the tribes for nine prytanies and for nine secretaryships were determined, there would be left one tribe for each office, and they must necessarily be different.

Note A. In the year 408-7 B.C., the tribes in the prytany seem to have been arranged in the reverse of the official order,—thus (1) \*Antiochis, (2) \*Aiantis, (3) \*Hippothontis, (4) \*Kekropis, (5) Oineis, (6) \*Akamantis, (7) Leontis, (8) Pandionis, (9) Aigeis, (10) \*Erechtheis.

Kirchhoff, on account of the like number of letters in the lines, and the like shaping of the letters, is inclined to join C.I.A. IV 1, 331, 4, p. 151 to I, 324. It is from I, 324 that we obtain the prytanies given above without an asterisk. He states that C.I.A. IV 1, 321, 4, p. 151, is probably the last portion of the accounts of the Erechtheum superintendents for the year. In it we have 'Επὶ τῆς . . . . . [ ]δος δεκάτῃ[ς πρυτανευούσῃ]ς. 'Ερεχθίδος exactly fits. I think that we must suppose that the reverse order of the tribes was followed in this year, unique as it now appears to be. The prytanies, therefore, for the whole year have been restored as above.

There are several inscriptions dealing with work done on the Erechtheum, viz., C.I.A. I, 321, 322, 323, 324; IV 1, 321, p. 74; IV 1, 321, p. 148. Michaelis, in *Mith. des deutsch. arch. Inst. zu Athen* XIV, 1889, p. 349ff., thinks that they all belong to one year, 409-8 B.C., and that they should be arranged in the order C.I.A. I, 322, 321; IV 1, 321, 1 and 2, p. 148; IV 1, 321, p. 74; I, 324. Kirchhoff does not venture to say whether he is right or not. By restoring as above, we show clearly that Michaelis is wrong, both in his disposition of the inscriptions, and in holding that they all belong to one year. C.I.A. I, 322, in which Kekropis holds the first prytany, and C.I.A. I, 324, in which we make Kekropis the fourth, obviously cannot belong to one year. C.I.A. I, 322 is dated by the archon in 409-8 B.C.; therefore, C.I.A. I, 324 does not belong to 409-8 B.C. It cannot fall to 410-9 B.C., 407-6 B.C., or 406-5 B.C. on account of the arrangement of the prytanies in these years, and so Kirchhoff's conjecture, that it belongs to the year 408-7 B.C., is confirmed. As we have seen, C.I.A. IV 1, 321, 4, p. 151, is likewise assigned to 408-7 B.C.; so that a certain degree of order is thrown into the fragments that deal with the erection of the Erechtheum.

§ 8. CHANGE FROM *Χειροτονία* TO *Κλήρωσις*. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SECRETARY'S NAME IN THE TITLES AND OFFICIAL HEADINGS OF DECREES.

Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 54, 3, says: *πρότερον μὲν οὖν οὗτος ἦν χειροτονήτος, καὶ τοὺς ἐνδοξοτάτους καὶ πιστοτάτους ἐχειροτόνον. καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς στήλαις πρὸς ταῖς συμμαχίαις καὶ προξενίαις καὶ πολιτείαις οὗτος ἀναγράφεται. νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληρωτός.*

He states that, before the principle of sortition was introduced into the election of the secretary, the most reputable and trustworthy citizens were chosen for that office; the inference being, that, since the change to the system followed in his day took place, the results were not always so happy. Now just what does the passage mean? In *οὗτος ἀναγράφεται* the allusion is certainly to the name of the secretary, and to nothing else. The question has been raised whether Aristotle sought proof for his conclusion, as to the position in the social world occupied by the secretaries in former times, from the mere presence of their names on tablets of the specified character, or from the social standing of the persons, whom such tablets show to have held the secretaryship. If the latter be true, the addition, *πρὸς ταῖς συμμαχίαις καὶ προξενίαις καὶ πολιτείαις*, is remarkable. It would indicate that the only sources, available to Aristotle for ascertaining who had been

secretaries, were the stelai mentioned. It is incredible that at Athens no other records were kept: and, as a matter of fact, all stelai, inscribed at the command of the senate and assembly, irrespective of the content of the matter inscribed, would have been available to Aristotle for such a purpose. Therefore, we are bound to fall back upon the conclusion that Aristotle is proving his point by the presence of the secretary's name, in documents, in which the mere fact of its presence, demonstrated the esteem and confidence, in which each individual secretary was held by his fellow citizens; and indeed this is the only conclusion for which there is any warrant in the text of Aristotle.

These documents are stelai on which are inscribed decrees dealing with international questions (*συμμαχίαι, προξενίαι, πολιτείαι*). As has been seen above, there are two places in decrees in which the name of the secretary may appear, the title, and the official heading. All decrees published by state authority, at all times, contain the secretary's name in the official heading. Therefore, Aristotle cannot possibly have referred to the official heading. Accordingly, without an examination of the facts, we are brought to the conclusion that, in the decrees meant by Aristotle, the writing referred to in the phrase *οὗτος ἀναγράφεται* was in the title. The facts prove this conclusion to be correct: for, with only four exceptions, all the intelligible decrees with the name of the secretary in the title, from the earliest times until the year 356-5 B.C., deal with treaties of alliance (*συμμαχίαι*), laudatory inscriptions in honor of states or individuals (*προξενίαι*), or articles of citizenship (*πολιτείαι*). The four exceptions are, C.I.A. IV 1, 27b, p. 59; I, 58; IV 1, 39a, p. 141; I, 61. They all contain the reports of special committees that have been nominated and instructed by the people to perform some specific duty. The first three deal with re-assessments of tribute, and the fourth with a revision of the laws. After 356-5 B.C., the secretary's name never appears in the title, and after 363-2 B.C., the first year in which we know that the secretary was an annual officer, only twice, once in 359-8 B.C. (C.I.A. II, 60), and again in 356-5 B.C. (C.I.A. II Add., 66b). If it was determined in 363-2 B.C., or even a few years earlier, to omit the

secretary's name in the title for the future, it is but natural that, from force of habit, it should have been inserted in a few instances in the years immediately following. Hence, we are justified in holding that, when the secretary became an annual officer, somewhere between 368-7 B.C. and 363-2 B.C., his name was dropped in the title.

In this way we have arrived at the time, at which the secretary was first elected by sortition instead of by show of hands; for it is evident from Aristotle that the omission of the name in the title marks the era of the introduction of the lot. We may say, therefore, that, somewhere between the years 368-7 B.C. and 363-2 B.C., the secretary became an annual officer, and hence was elected by lot according to the general practice in the case of yearly public officers. Now just what is meant by the change from election by show of hands to election by lot? The only part popular election could have played in the earlier process was in the selection of the individual from among his fellow tribesmen. This seems clearly to have been what Aristotle meant by *χειροτονία*. After 363-2 B.C. the individual and not merely the tribe was selected by lot. This change well illustrates the idea that lay behind the usage of sortition. This was to prevent the ablest men in the state, the men most capable of governing, and recognized as such, from being chosen regularly or frequently to fill the ordinary administrative positions. To effect this, as Aristotle says, *τὰς δ' ἀρχὰς τὰς περὶ τὴν ἐγκύκλιον διοίκησιν ἀπάσας ποιοῦσι κληρωτὰς*. Of course, the object aimed at was to secure the supremacy of the *demos*; for the less the power of the executive, the greater that of the people. So long as the secretary was an official of the senate, or rather of a prytany of the senate, he was chosen by show of hands, in all probability from among his fellow senators. But when he became a state officer, to offset his increased powers, the lot was used in his election.

It seems that from the presence of his name in the title Aristotle could judge that the secretary was a man of high position in the state. The limitations to the appearance of his name, and the uncertainty of its appearance within these limitations, make it difficult to see what useful purpose its presence served. It is

noteworthy, however, that it was over *stelai pròs taìs symmachíais kai proxeníais kai politeíais* that anaglyphs were placed, and observation shows that, where there is an anaglyph, there is usually found a title with the secretary's name in it. Further, the secretary's name in the title is almost always written out in full in large-sized letters, the deme name being rarely omitted. All these facts seem to me to indicate that the presence of the secretary's name in the title is due entirely to motives of ostentation.

The presence of the secretary's name in the official heading has been thought by some to have been, in the fifth century, a means of dating the decree. I can find no proof for this view. It is true that the secretary's name is invariably present in the official heading of decrees, and the archon's usually absent. It is true, also, that with the archon's name in the public accounts is joined the name of the secretary for the first prytany of the year. The only bearing, if any, which the latter fact has is upon the much vexed question of the sacred and civil years. The only conclusion that the former yields is that the fifth century inscriptions were not, as a rule, dated at all. It is true that, in one case, *ἐνγγραφαί* are cited by the name of a secretary (C.I.A. I, 31, l. 16). That this is the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* is not certain. The *ἐνγγραφεῖς* themselves may have had a secretary. It is equally true that *ψηφίσματα* are never cited by the name of the secretary, but by the name of the mover or archon. It does not appear likely that we are to recognize a difference, in the significance of the presence of the secretary's name in the official heading, as between the fifth century, and those following. This being the case, the fact that decrees, published by private individuals or associations, bear the archon's name, but lack the secretary's, seems to show that the secretary's name in the official heading distinguishes the official publication.<sup>1</sup> An examination of the inscriptions shows that no decree, ordered to be set up by the state and of which we possess the official copy, lacks the name of the secretary. On the other hand, if the inscription be copied from an officially published decree and set up by a private individual, or set up by a

<sup>1</sup> Hartel in his *Studien* seems to me to have proved this point conclusively.

private individual from the unpublished state copy kept in the Metroon, it always lacks the secretary's name.

To certify that an inscription has been published by state authority is, therefore, the prime reason for the presence of the secretary's name in the official headings of inscriptions. As a secondary reason, is the guarantee, thereby given, that the published copy is word for word as the resolution passed by the state assemblies.

The idea might be obtained, from the great frequency with which the secretary's name is connected with the publication of decrees, that that was his sole or most important duty. Such is not the case. According to Aristotle the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρωταντίαν τῶν γραμμάτων ἐστὶ κύριος, καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τὰ γινόμενα φυλάττει καὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἀντιγράφεται. That is to say, the duties of the secretary consisted, for the most part, in receiving, keeping, and checking off with the original copies, the state decrees, which, unless otherwise specifically disposed of, were stored in the Metroon (C.I.A. iv 2, 458b, l. 16ff.). If any were to be published, he was the official to have it done.

μαχίαις καὶ  
observation  
ly found a  
ary's name  
zed letters,  
seem to me  
the title is  
  
heading has  
ry, a means  
view. It is  
the official  
It is true,  
nts is joined  
year. The  
on the much  
only conclu-  
inscriptions  
in one case,  
I, 31, l. 16).  
he ἐνγγραφείς  
ly true that  
etary, but by  
r likely that  
the presence  
between the  
case, the fact  
associations,  
seems to show  
inguishes the  
ptions shows  
of which we  
ary. On the  
officially pub-  
or set up by a  
  
at conclusively.

## § 9. SECRETARIES MENTIONED IN THE PREAMBLES OF DECREES.

In the following list, the date given to each inscription is that fixed by the Editor of the Corpus, Vol. II. (U. Koehler), unless it is marked with an asterisk. In that case I have assigned the date, or restored some portion of the name myself.

Year B.C.	Tribe	Name and Deme of Secretary	Reference
363-2	Antiochis	Νικόστρατος [Φ.....] Παλληνεύς	II, 54, 55. IV 2, 54b, Ditt. Syll. I, 71.
362-1	Oineis	'Αγαθαρχος 'Αγαθάρχου 'Οἶθεν	II and IV 2, 56 and 57. II Add., 57b.
361-0	Aiantis	Χαρ[ί]ου Χαρυνν[τ]ου Φυληνεύς[ς]	IV 2, 59b.
360-9		Φυνόκλ[ης] ---	II, 60.
359-8	Hippothontis	* ---[ς] ππος Σμερό[θου] Κεραύδης	IV 2, 60b, cf. II, 672 and 996.
358-7	Erechtheis	* [Τε]ρο[κλείδης].....Δαμ[π]τρο[εύς]	II Add., 82b.
357-6	Pandionis	Διόδοτος [Δ]ιοκλέους 'Α[γ]γελήθεν	II, 62, 63.
356-5	Kekropis	* Ανάσις Δ[υ]σ[ιμάχου] Πιθ[εύς]	II, 66, Add., 66b.
355-4	Leontis	[Πάν]διος Σωκλέους ἐξ Οἴου	II, 67-70. IV 2, 70.
354-3		Πρωκλείδης 'Αναχωρο[ίδος].....	II, 71. IV 2, 71, 71b, 71c, 71d.
353-2	Antiochis	..... ἦδης Δωροθέου Παλλην[εύς]	II, 72. IV 2, 72b.
352-1	Erechtheis	* Καλλιᾶδης Εὔω[νυμεύς]	II, 105, Add., 105b.
351-0	Aigeis		
350-9	Pandionis	Δεΐχης Δημάρχου Φρε[αίρ]ος	II, 107. IV 2, 107, 107b, 107c.
349-8	Leontis		
348-7	Akamantis	Αυσύμαχος Σωσιδήμου 'Αχαρνεύς	II, 109, 110. IV 2, 109b.
347-6	Oineis	* Κηφισώ[δ]ωρος 'Αθη[ν]οφάνου[ς]	IV 2, 110c. II, 75.
346-5	Kekropis	Φ]λυνεύς	

<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Tribes</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary.</i>	<i>References</i>
349-8	Leontis	Διεύχης Δημαρχου Φρε[αρ]ιος	II, 107. IV 2, 107, 107b, 107c.
348-7	Akamantis	Αυσίμαχος Σωσιδήμιον Ἀχαρνεῖς	II, 109, 110. IV 2, 109b.
347-6	Oineis	*Κρητισά[δ]ιος Ἀθη[ν]οφάνου[ς]	IV 2, 110c. II, 75.
346-5	Kekropis	Φ]λυεύς	
345-4	Hippothontis	..... ξενος ..... ἐξ Οἰό[ν]	IV 2, 111b, 111c, 1. 25.
344-3	Aiantis	*Χρέμης Φ..... δης	II, 111.
343-2	Antiochis	Κλεόστρατος Τιμοσθένης Αἰγυλεύς	II, 114 C. IV 2, 114b, 114c.
342-1	Erechtheis	*Ονήσιππο[ς] Ἀραφίνιος	II, 116.
341-0	Aigeis	*Ἀσπέτος [Ἀσπέτου Κυθήριος]	II, 117, 809c, 1. 71.
340-9	Pandionis	*Φ[ιλ]ππος Ἀντιφ[ών]τος Εἰ[πει]ός	II, 121, 122, 13c.
339-8	Leontis	Χαῖρεστρατος Ἀμενίο[ν] Ἀχαρνεῖς	II, 123-127.
338-7	Akamantis	..... *Μελαγ[ά]ιδρον [Ξυπεριτών]	IV 2, 128c. II, 943.
337-6	Oineis	*Πρόξενος Πυλαγόρου Ἀχεροΐσιος	IV 2, 128b, 1. 2. II Add., 567b. Wilh. Ber., p. 6.
336-5	Kekropis	*Μνησίφαλος Μνήσω[ς] Φυληρεῖς	II, 230. IV 2, 163b.
335-4	Hippothontis	*Ἀρχέλιος Χαυρίον Παλληρεῖς	II, 169. IV 2, 169b. C. I G. Sept. I, 3499.
334-3	Aiantis	*Ἀριστάνους Ἀριστάνου Ἀναγυράσιος	II, 173, 174, 183. IV 2, 173b. C. I G. Sept. I, 4252 and 4253.
333-2	Antiochis	- - - *Κ]ολλυρε[ν]ς	IV 2, 115b.
332-1	Erechtheis	*Ἀντίδορος Ἀντίου Πα[ν]α[ν]εῖς	II, 176, 177.
331-0	Aigeis	Σωστράτιδης Ἐχφάντων Εἰπιπρίδης	II, 178. IV 2 Add., 178. C. I G. Sept. I, 4254.
330-9	Pandionis	*Πυθόδηλος Πυθόδηλου Ἀγοῖσιος	IV 2, 178b. II, 236.
329-8	Leontis		
328-7	Akamantis	*Ἀντιφῶν Κοροῖβον Ἐλεσάντιος	II, 179. IV 2, 179b, 1. 2.
327-6	Oineis	..... ε Φρίνσιος [Ραμνοΐσιος]	IV 2, 180c.
326-5	Kekropis	[Εἰ]καλ[ης] II]θηδόρων Ἀλωπεκ[ή]θε]ν	II, 181-183. IV 2, 231b.
325-4	Hippothontis	Εἰθυγενής Ἡφαιστοδῆμον Κηφαιεύς	II, 185, 186, 188. IV 2, 185b.
324-3	Aiantis		
323-2	Antiochis		
322-1	Erechtheis		



## § 10. OFFICIAL ORDER OF THE TRIBES IN THE SECRETARYSHIP DURING THE FOURTH CENTURY B.C.

It has long been known that, in some year between 368-7 B.C. and 363-2 B.C., the secretary mentioned in the preamble of the decrees, in place of changing with each prytany, came to hold office for the whole year. The exact year of the change has not been definitely established, nor can it be, until more inscriptions of this period have been discovered.

In the list given above, the first point to be observed is that, in a period of ten years, one secretary from each of the ten tribes holds office. This is all but demonstrably true of the period 362-1 to 353-2 B.C. inclusive. It is certainly true of the ten years 342-1 to 343-2 B.C. inclusive, and of the two ten year periods that follow. The second, and more important point to be noticed, is that, for the thirty years 352-1 to 323-2 B.C. inclusive, the tribes, from which the secretaries are selected, follow one another in the official order. This requires no demonstration: it can be seen at a glance. The official order of the tribes has been well known heretofore; but it has always been looked upon as a purely descriptive thing: it has never been known to have had anything to do with an annual office. If there were ten men in a board, their names, if published, were seen to be frequently arranged in the official order of their tribes. But that the official order was anything more than a kind of alphabetical method of arranging names, has now for the first time been demonstrated.

In the year 322-1 B.C. a new ten years period was begun in the usual way, with a secretary from the tribe Erechtheis, but on the 20th of Boedromion the Lamian war was ended by a Macedonian garrison entering Mounychia. We have evidence that the democratic method of procedure was not at once thrown aside. During the whole of this archon-year, the demos as usual attended to the public business, and the secretary<sup>1</sup> continued to publish the decrees. It is most likely that it was at the beginning of the year 321-20 B.C. that the democratic forms were abolished, the twelve thousand of the poorer citizens disfranchised, an oligarchic timoc-

<sup>1</sup> C.I.A. II, 185, 186, 188.

racy established, and a fundamental change made in the branch of the service to which the secretary belonged.

This much said, it merely remains to make some simple remarks on the list given above, and to substantiate the restorations suggested. In the first place it is shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that the view taken earlier in regard to the number of the officials dealing with the publication of the decrees is correct. Before 363 B.C., there is absolutely no evidence to show that there existed, at any one time, more than one secretary with this duty. Between 363-2 B.C. and 322-1 B.C., there is only one secretary mentioned in the formulae of the decrees; he holds office for a year, and has two titles, *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*, and *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*. The second is a new title which gradually displaces the first. This is incontestible; for it is certain that the person whose duty is specified in the decree, is identical with the one, whose name is given in the preamble of the decree; and the person, named in the preamble of a decree, and in the same decree given the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς*, is shown by his tribe to be a member of the same system of tribe rotation as the person named in the preamble of another decree, and in the same decree given the title *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*. The secretaries follow one another in the official order of the tribes they represent whether they are called *γραμματεῖς τῆς βουλῆς*, or *γραμματεῖς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*. Indeed, the same conclusion seems to be forced upon us by what Aristotle<sup>1</sup> says of the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*; for, manifestly,

<sup>1</sup> Those who maintain that *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* and *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* denote different persons are obliged to assume a mistake on the part of Aristotle. Thus Caillemer, Daremberg et Saglio II, p. 1648, says:

Pour le *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, il y a moins de difficultés, bien qu'il soit à peu près certain pour nous qu'Aristote applique à ce secrétaire des observations qui ne sont vraies que pour le *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς* du v<sup>e</sup> siècle. C'est de ce dernier seul qu'on peut dire qu'il a été autrefois élu et que l'élection portait sur les citoyens les plus illustres et les plus dignes de confiance. Le *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* a toujours été tiré au sort parmi les prytanes.

So Penndorf, Leipz. Stud. XVIII, p. 135f., from another point of view argues: Iam quaeras, qui fiat, ut Aristoteles eum (*i.e.*, *γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς*) neglexerit. Ac primum quidem id dubium esse nequit, quin revera ad *γραμματέα τῆς βουλῆς* fere vocatum spectent illa verba, de quibus modo

the secretary who in Aristotle's day was κληρωτός was in earlier times χειροτονητός, while it is universally held that the secretary χειροτονητός was the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς, the only one of this character that existed in former times. The title γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν I take to mean, the 'secretary who held office prytany after prytany', *i.e.*, 'for a series of prytanies', and cite, in support of this interpretation of κατὰ πρυτανείαν, the common phrases καθ' ἡμέραν, 'day after day', 'day by day', 'daily', and κατὰ μῆνα 'month after month'.

There was no possibility of there existing at Athens such a thing as a professional class of secretaries; for no individual could hold the office more than twice in a period of twenty years, and, as a matter of fact, in the whole period of Athenian history, there is not a single instance of the same person holding the office a second time.

As to the body from which the secretary was elected by lot (νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληρωτός):—in the year 341–0 B.C., the secretary for the year was 'Ονήσιππος 'Αραφίγιος (C.I.A. II, 116), of the tribe Aigeis. Now, as it happens, we have a list of the senators of the tribe Aigeis for that year (Dittenberger, Sylloge 334 A; Bull v, p. 361ff.), and 'Ονήσιππος 'Αραφίγιος is not among the number. Un-

egimus: priore aetate illustrissimos ac fidelissimos homines scribas esse creatos. Sed velim ea acriter attendas. Disserens enim de scriba κατὰ πρυτανείαν, qui tunc erat, tradit haec: πρότερον μὲν οὗτος ἦν χειροτονητός—νῦν δὲ γέγονε κληρωτός. *Habet igitur priorem senatus scribam, qui sane secundum prytaniam mutabatur, eodem loco ac posteriorem κατὰ πρυτανείαν scribam, publicum, sorte ductum.* Idem manifestum fit his: καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς στήλαις -- οὗτος ἀναγράφεται: scilicet in praescriptis decretorum exaratur γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν olim senatorius tum publicus. Aristoteles autem utrumque prorsus aequat, nisi quod unum significat discrimen: quondam creationem in usu fuisse, postea sortitionem. Recenset enim illum suo iure inter ἀρχὰς κληρωτάς. Cum autem depingendam sibi proposuerit eam rerum publicarum formam, quae ab Euclide restituta in posterum vigeat, dignum habet adnotatu, quae res hac aetate novatae sint; et fuit ille scriba vel post Euclidem per aliquantum tempus χειροτονία creatus. Neque vero meminit rei multo gravioris: scribas priore aetate revera quaque prytania mutatos fuisse senatores, posteriore autem magistratus publicos et annuos. *Inimmo duobus generibus non distinctis unam quasi continuam eorum propagationem statuit.* Iam fieri non potest, ut simul disserat pristinum senatus scribam etiamtum exstare iuxta γραμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανείαν.

fortunately for the settlement of the question, there are inscribed on the stone the names of forty-nine senators only. (See E. Gollob, *Wiener Studien* III, p. 209ff.). There is left the possibility that the fiftieth was the secretary for the year; but, as the name was lacking on the stone when set up, it seems to me very unlikely that one of the officers for the year would be passed by intentionally. I, therefore, hold that the secretary was not a senator, but was elected by lot from among the other members of the tribe.

Two lists of the officers of the senate may here be considered.

(1) C.I.A. II, 114 (343-2 B.C.).

[γραμματ]ε[ύ]ς κατὰ π[ρυτα]νείαν ·  
Κλεόστρατος Τιμοσθένης Αἰγυλίου  
ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα ·  
Δημόφιλος Πανταλέοντος Ἀγρυλῆθεν  
ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν ·  
Κηφισοφῶν Κεφαλίωνος Ἀφιδναῖος  
βουλῆς ταμίαι ·

Ἀντικλῆς Ἀριστοκράτους Κυδαθηναίος  
Δρομοκλείδης Θρασυμήδους Ἀγνούσιος.

(2) A. Wilhelm, Bericht, p. 6 f. (335-4 B.C.)

γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν ·  
Πρόξενος Πυλαγόρον Ἀχερδούσιος  
γραμματεὺς τῷ δήμῳ  
ἀναγραφεὺς ·  
ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα ·  
ἀντιγραφεὺς ·  
ταμίης τῇ βουλῇ ·  
ταμίης τῶν εἰς τὸ ἀνάθημα ·  
κῆρυξ.

It must be noted that they are officers of the senate as a whole, not of a particular prytany, and, therefore, hold office for a year. The γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, Κλεόστρατος Τιμοσθένης Αἰγυλίου, is found in the preamble of two decrees of the year 343-2 B.C., C.I.A. IV 2, 114b and 114c, and Πρόξενος Πυλαγόρον Ἀχερδούσιος may be restored in the preamble of C.I.A. IV 2, 128b, l. 2 (335-4 B.C.).

The official ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα has been usually identified with the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς. This is clearly impossible. There is no reason for thinking him a secretary at all, any more than the officer ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν, who does not appear in the later list. This office was probably abolished in 339 B.C., when the theoric was converted into a military fund.

### § II. RESTORATIONS.

360-9 B.C. The editor of C.I.A. II states that Φαντοκλ[ῆς] must belong to either 360-9 B.C. or 359-8 B.C. This being the case, he must belong to 360-9 B.C.

359-8 B.C. Κεϊριάδης, restored from C.I.A. II, 672 and 996 (there wrongly written [Εἰρεσί]δης), in both of which a man named Σμύςυθος comes from this deme, exactly fills the lacuna.

358-7 B.C. There is no reason why [Ιε]ροκ[λεί]δης [. . . . .] [Δομ]π[τρ]εύς (C.I.A. II Add., 82b) should not be assigned to this year. The preamble of C.I.A. II Add., 82b begins [Ἐπὶ . . . .] [. . . . ἀρχ]οντος. The archon for 358-7 B.C., written thus, Κηφισοδότο, exactly fills the lacuna.

356-5 B.C. [Πιθ]εύς: I have accepted the conjecture of Eustratiadis (C.I.A. II Add., 66b, frg. A & B., editor's note). The father's name might be filled out thus, Δυσιμάχων.

352-1 B.C. C.I.A. II, 105 has [Κ]αλλιιάδης; Koehler assigns it positively to Ol. 107, and picks out Θύελλος, the name of the archon for 351-0 B.C., as the name best suited to the lacuna. C.I.A. II Add., 105b, has Καλλιιάδης Εὐω[νυμεὺς ἐγραμμά]τενε, and is dated thus: [Ἐπὶ . . . . .](ς?) ἀρχοντος. Koehler remarks, "*subjeci haec titulo 105, quia facile aliquis animum inducere possit utrumque fragmentum ad eundem annum referendum esse. Mihi quidem idonea causa cur sic statuatur non esse videtur.*" If with so considerable a discrepancy between the number of letters in Θύελλου (written perhaps Θύελλο) and [. . . . .]ς, one might take them to belong to the same year, it may be pardonable, perhaps, to restore Ἀριστοδήμο, which exactly fills the lacuna in C.I.A. II Add., 105b and is no worse in C.I.A. II, 105, than Θύελλο is in C.I.A. II Add., 105b. Aristodemos was archon in 352-1 B.C., and a secretary from Erechtheis was due to this year.

346-5 B.C. Penndorf, Leipz. Stud. 1897, p. 197 puts C.I.A. II, 75 and C.I.A. IV 2, 110c together, and completes the secretary's name as above.

344-3 B.C. Koehler dates C.I.A. II, 111 in some year between 348-7 B.C. and 336-5 B.C. Excepting the year 348-7 B.C. itself, 344-3 B.C. is the only one available within this period, the name of the archon for which fits the lacuna.

340-9 B.C. I have added a deme to the name of the secretary given in C.I.A. II, 117 from C.I.A. II, 809c, l. 71 (325-4 B.C.), in which a person named Δημόστρατος Ἀσπέτον Κυθήριος, whom I take to be a son of the secretary for 340-9 B.C., is mentioned. The father's name is a pure conjecture.

338-7 B.C. In C.I.A. II, 121, is mentioned a secretary named Φί[λι]ππος Ἀντιφ . . . . . In C.I.A. 130, the following secretary is given, -- Εἰ[τε]αῖος. The latter inscription is dated by Koehler in some year between 356-5 B.C. and 336-5 B.C. (C.I.A. II, p. 58). The deme Εἰτεαῖος belongs to the tribe Akamantis. During this period there are only two years to which it could be ascribed, viz., 348-7 B.C., and 338-7 B.C. I have placed it in 338-7 B.C., because, after restoring the common name, Antiphon, for the father of the secretary, Εἰτεαῖος exactly fills the remaining space.

336-5 B.C. Ξυπεταίων is the only deme of the tribe Kekropis that fills the lacuna in C.I.A. IV 2, 128c. The name of the secretary's father [Μελησ]άνδρον I have restored from C.I.A. II, 943, in which the name Μελήσανδρος Ξυπεταίων occurs among the *διατηγταί* for 325-4 B.C. As the *διατηγταί* were all sixty years of age, it is not at all unlikely that he had a son old enough to be secretary in 336-5 B.C.

335-4 B.C. The secretary's name is given thus: Πρόξενος [Π . . . . .] I have filled up the lacuna from C.I.A. II Nov. Add., 567b (287-6 B.C.). In this inscription a man named Πρόξενος Πυλαγόρον Ἀχερδοῦσιος makes the motion. He may have been the same person or perhaps his grandson. The name fits the lacuna exactly. (Since writing the above, an inscription has been deciphered by A. Wilhelm, (see above p. 37) which contains the name as restored, with the title γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν.)

334-3 B.C. In C.I.A. II, 230, we have *Μνησίφιλος Μνήσων[ος]* [..... ε] *ἐγραμμάτευε*. In 334-3 B.C., Aiantis must have furnished the secretary, and, of the tribe Aiantis, there are only two demes, *Περρῖδος* and *Φαληρεὺς*, that fill the lacuna exactly.

331-0 B.C. In C.I.A. IV 2, 115b, a man from Kollytos is said to have been secretary. Koehler dates the inscription in 342-1 B.C. The decree refers to the reception accorded certain ambassadors from Athens at Epidamnus and Apollonia, and commends the good-will shown them by two citizens, one of Epidamnus, and the other of Apollonia. The motion is made by a man named *Πολύευκτ[ος]* . . . . . *Σφήτ[τιος]*. In 343-2 B.C., a man named *Πολύευκτος* is known to have accompanied Demosthenes on an embassy to the Peloponnese and Acarnania. Koehler assumes that this is the embassy referred to, and dates the inscription in 342-1 B.C., because the deme of the secretary will not allow him to place it in 343-2 B.C. The deme of the secretary, in the light of present knowledge, as little allows it to belong to 342-1 B.C. It must belong to either 351-0 B.C. or 331-0 B.C., and from the fact that in the preamble we find *ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Διονύσου*, it must be dated in 331-0 B.C.; for this part of the preamble is found in no other decree before 338 B.C., and is just as much an anachronism in the year assigned by Koehler as it would be in 351-0 B.C.

328-7 B.C. By assigning C.I.A. II, 236, and C.I.A. IV 2, 178b, to the same year, the archon and the name of the secretary may be restored in the former, and the deme of the secretary in the latter.<sup>1</sup> In both decrees the restorations suit the lacunae.

#### § 12. THE FIFTEEN YEARS OF CONFUSION BETWEEN 322-1 B.C. AND 307-6 B.C.

At the beginning of the year 321-0 B.C., if not earlier, an oligarchic form of government had replaced the democracy. Simultaneously with this revolution came changes in the disposal of the decrees the greatly diminished demos passed.

In the year 335-4 B.C., and again in some subsequent year, we know of the existence of an official called *ὁ ἀναγραφεὺς*. Of his

<sup>1</sup> This restoration was suggested to me by Mr. C. O. Harris, A.B., of Cornell University.

duties we are told only that they were ἐπιμέλεισθαι τῆς ἀναγραφῆς τῶν γραμμάτων. No such title being found in Aristotle's Πολιτεία, it has been commonly held that the office did not come into existence till after 325 B.C. This view has been positively disproved by the list of "Mitglieder des Rathes" given above (p. 37). The fact that he is not mentioned by Aristotle indicates one of two things, either that his duties were of very little importance, or that he was not a permanent official. His appearance in 335-4 B.C., and again fifteen years later, precludes the latter alternative. When the state of affairs at Athens was normal, the official who attended to the registration of state documents would have had ceremonial rather than actual duties to perform. It was not an unusual thing at Athens to appoint an individual or committee to attend to the codification of the laws. The ἀναγραφεὺς τῶν νόμων, accused by Lysias' client in speech xxx, assumed importance only through the disorganization that attended the last years of the Peloponnesian War, and the overthrow of the democracy. So it was with the ἀναγραφεὺς τῶν γραμμάτων. Before the Lamian War, he was probable a subordinate to the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν and did clerical work in the Metroon. The official ἐπὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα was in all likelihood his colleague. Both are probably included among the ἄλλοι γραμματεῖς οἱ ἐπὶ τοῖς δημοσίοις γράμμασιν mentioned in C.I.A. II, 61. The reorganization of the state in the form of an oligarchy brought about a reversal in the positions of the ἀναγραφεὺς and the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν. Henceforth, the secretary was to be a prytany official—a member of the presiding prytany most probably. The registrar took from him the duty of publishing the decrees of the senate and assembly. This is clearly indicated by the presence of the name and title of the registrar in the preamble of the decrees, along with, and taking precedence over, the name of the secretary, and more clearly still by the fact that in the decree itself the ἀναγραφεὺς, not the γραμματεὺς as heretofore, is instructed to attend to the publication.

The ἀναγραφεὺς was in the past an officer of the senate as a whole and therefore annual. He remained still an annual officer, and for the three years of the oligarchy we possess the names of the three registrars.



Year B.C.	Name and Deme of Registrar	References	Tribes of Registrar
321-0	Θρασυκλῆς Ναυσικράτους Θριάσιος	IV 2, 229b. II, 234.	Oineis
320-9	Ἀρχέδεκος Ναυκρίτου Λαμπτ[ρεύ]ς	IV 2, 192b, 192c.	Erechtheis
319-8	Ἐπικούρου τοῦ..... σίου	II Add., 299b. IV 2, 299c	

During this period, the γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείων was a prytany officer. There were, therefore, thirty of them during the three years. Of these only the following remain :

Year B.C.	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribes of Secretary	Tribes in Prytany
321-0				
320-9	Θεραμένης Κηφισιεύς	IV 2, 192c.	Erechtheis	Erechtheis
320-9	[Νε]κόδημος Ἀνα- [φ]λυ[σ]τιος	II, 191, 192. IV 2, 192b.	Antiochis	Antiochis
319-8				

The secretary again changed with the prytany, but, unlike the secretary before 363-2 B.C., belonged to the tribe in the prytany.

Upon the restoration of the democracy at the end of Gamelion or the beginning of Anthesterion of the year 319-8 B.C., the old order of things was re-established. The ἀναγραφεὺς, however, is never found afterwards, and, as he would undoubtedly have been mentioned among the δῖοιτοι had he been in existence, the inference is that the irate demos abolished the office altogether. The secretary again assumed the duty of publishing the decrees (C.I.A. IV 2, 231b, l. 67.)

We know that it was upon the death of Antipatros that Polysperchon had the democracy re-established at Athens, and that Demetrios of Phaleron was one of the members of Phokion's party, who escaped their leader's fate by going into exile on this occasion. How long the demos controlled is uncertain : but we are informed that it was in the year 317 B.C., at some time later than the first of the month of Poseideon (Dec.-Jan.), that Kassandros, whose officer, Nikanor, had all the time held the Peiraieus, bade the Athenians receive back Demetrios of Phaleron as ἐπιστάτης or προστάτης τοῦ δήμου. Demetrios is said to have preserved the forms

of the democracy in their entirety. Whether the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείων* was again chosen from the tribes in the official order cannot be decided. It seems probable that he was not; for during the four years that immediately follow the expulsion of Demetrios, at the end of 308-7 B.C., an official order of the tribes of the secretaries cannot be made out. The following is the list of secretaries for the period 318-7 to 307-6 B.C.:

<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>References</i>
Θέραιππος Ἴππο[.....ε]ύς	IV 2, 231b, 1. 36.
Κλειγ[ένης]	II, 835.
- - Δ]αμπ[τρεύς]	II, 222.
- - - νεύς	II, 230.
- - - ωνος Ἐλευσύν[ιος]	II, 231.
- ἰ]δης Ν[α...]ος . ι -	II, 231.
- ασ]ανοπών[πο]ν Π[ο]τά[μιος] ?	II, 238.
- -ο]ς Παμνοῖσιω[ς]	II, 244. <i>Hermes</i> XV, p. 343.
- - ο]ς Θορα[ιεύς]	II, 245.
Ἀριστ.....	IV 2, 245b.
- ος	IV 2, 245d.

The first secretary in the list belongs to the year 318-7 B.C. Unfortunately his deme name is incomplete. To no one of the others can the year be assigned.

In the year 308-7 B.C., Demetrios Poliorketes got possession of the Peiraeus and Demetrios of Phaleron fled from Athens. It was not till the year 307-6 B.C., however, that Mounychia was taken and handed over to the Athenians and full liberty restored to the *δῆμος*. Out of gratitude to their deliverer, the Athenians added the two tribes, Antigonis and Demetrias, to the original number, and gave them the first and second places, respectively, in the official order. In 307-6 B.C., they for the first time had their representatives in the state offices. To them were assigned demes drawn from the old tribes. The names of all these re-allotted demes have not yet been agreed upon. Certain of them<sup>1</sup> have, however, and of these alone I purpose to make use in the investigations which follow.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. F. O. Bates, Fellow of Cornell University, in his inaugural dissertation, "The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes," has presented the most exhaustive treatment on the distribution of these demes.

§ 13. OFFICIAL ORDER OF THE TRIBES IN THE SECRETARYSHIP DURING THE LAST THREE CENTURIES BEFORE CHRIST.

With the year 293-2 B.C., the list of eponymous archons given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus ends. Diodorus Siculus carries us only through the year 302-1 B.C., and the newly discovered fragment of the 'Parian Chronicle fails us at practically the same time; so that from the year 293-2 B.C. on, we have to collect an archon-list from the stray references in the later Greek writers and the names found in the Inscriptions.

A glance at the lists of archons offered by Meier in his *Commentatio Epigraphica Secunda*, by Neubauer in his *Commentationes Epigraphicae*, by Dumont in his *Essai* and *Fastes Éponymiques*, by Unger in *Philologus*, Homolle in the *Bulletin*, and Schoeffer in the *Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie* will satisfy anyone that unanimity has not yet been attained. Nevertheless, there are certain groups of two or more archons whose order, if not dates, no one can dispute. Obviously, it is upon the secretaries, who held office for the years designated by these groups, that we must depend for evidence as to the continuation or non-continuation of the official order of their tribes during the three centuries under consideration.

These secretaries and archons are as follows :

## I

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	λδ.	Tribe
303-2	Leostratos	Διόφαντος Διονυσιοδώρου Φηγούσιος	3	Erechtheis
302-1	Nikokles	Νίκων Θεοδώρου Πλωθένς	4	Aigeis
301-0	Klearchos	Μνήσαρχ[ος .....]ου Προβαλίσσιος	5	Pandionis
300-9	Hegemachos		6*	Leontis
299-8	Euktemon	Θεόφιλος[Ξεν]ο[φών]τος Κεφαλῆθεν	7	Akamantis

## II

290-9	Diokles	Ξενοφῶ[ν Ν]ικέου Ἀλαιεύς	4	Aigeis
289-8	Diotimos	Λυσίστρατος [Ἀ]ριστο[μ]άχου Παιανιεύς	5	Pandionis
288-7	Isaios		6*	Leontis
287-6	Euthios	Ναυσιμένης Ναυσικίδου Χολαργεύς	7	Akamantis

<sup>1</sup> Mitth. 1897, p. 183 ff.

SECRETARY-  
CHRIST.

chons given  
as carries us  
covered frag-  
y the same  
to c c t  
reek writers

n his *Com-  
menta-*

and *Fastes*  
n the *Bul-  
Encyclopædie*

en attained.

ore archons

iously, it is

designated by

the co' u-

ribes g

Tribe

rechtheis

igeis

andionis

eonis

kamantis

geis

ndionis

ontis

amantis

III

283-2 Menekles	Θεόδωρος Λυσισθέου [Τρικωρ]ύσιος	11 Aiantis
282-1 Nikias Otr.	Ἰσοκράτης Ἰσοκράτου Ἀλωπε- κῆθεν	12 Antiochis

IV

275-4 Polyuktos	Χαιρεφῶν Ἀρχιστράτου Κεφα- λήθεν	7 Akamantis
274-3 Hieron	Φαινύλος Πανφίλου Ὀῆθεν	8 Oineis

V

242-1 Kallimedes	[Καλ]ίας Καλλιάρχου Πλωθέν	4 Aigeis
241-0		5 *Pandionis
240-9 Thersilochos	Διόδωτος Διογενήτου Φρεαρίβιος	6 Leontis

VI

188-7 Symmachos	Ἀρχικλῆς Θεοδώρου Θορέκιος	6 Akamantis
187-6 Theoxenos		7 *Oineis
186-5 Zopyros	Μεγάριστος Πύρρον Αἰξωνε[ύ]ς	8 Kekropis

VII

169-8 Eunikos	Ἱερώνυμ[ος] Βοήθου Κηφισιεύς	1 Erechtheis
168-7 Xenokles	Σθενέδημος Ἀσκ(λ)ηπιάδου Τει- θράσιος	2 Aigeis

VIII

129-8 Lykiskos		5 *Ptolemais
128-7 Dionysios		6 *Akamantis
127-6 Theodorides		7 *Oineis
126-5 Diotimos		8 *Kekropis
125-4 Jason	- Ἀναξικράτου Ἐλευσίνιος	9 Hippothontis
124-3 Nikias and Isigenes		10 *Aiantis
123-2 Demetrios		11 *Antiochis
122-1 Nikodemos	Ἐπιγένης Ἐπιγένου Οἰναιῶς	12 Attalis

IX

119-8 Aristarchos	Τελέστης Μηδείου Παυινιεύς	3 Pandionis
118-7 Agathokles	Ἐκκλῆς Ξενάνδρου Αἰθα[λίδη]ς	4 Leontis

## X

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	Name and Deme of Priest of Serapis	Tribe
137-6			{ [Τ]ιμ ... Δημόσι[ος] Δημόσιο[ς] Φανόβιος 'Ελενσί- νιο[ς]	Hippothontis
136-5			{ Δημήτριος 'Αστίας Τρικορύσιος	Aiantis
135-4			{ Ζήνων 'Αναφλύστιος	Antiochis
134-3			{ 'Ελλην Σουνιεύς	Attalis
133-2			{ [Κη]φισόδωρος Λαμ- πτρεύς	Erechtheis
132-1			{ [Μ]ένανδρος Φιλιάδης	Aigeis
131-0			{ [Δι]οκλῆς Παιανιεύς	Pandionis
130-9			{ Νέων Λευκοροεύς	Leontis
129-8 Lykiskos			{ Σωκλῆς Φλυεύς	Ptolemais
128-7 Dionysios			{ Εὐθύμαχος ἐκ Κερα- μέων	Akamantis
127-6 Theodorides			{ Λυκίσκος 'Αχαρνεύς	Oineis
126-5 Diotimos			{ 'Αθηνιαγώρας Μελι- τείς	Kekropis
125-4 Jason	- 'Αναξικράτου 'Ελευσίνιος		{ [Θε]όφαντος	Hippothontis
124-3 Nikias and Isigenes			{ Δημήτριος Μαραθώ- νιος	Aiantis
123-2 Demetrios			{ Δημόφιλος 'Αλωπε- κῆθεν	Antiochis
122-1 Nikodemos	'Επιγένης 'Επιγέ- νου Οἰναῖος		{ Διοκλῆς Τυρμείδης	Attalis
121-0			{ Δημήτριος Περγασῆ- θεν	Erechtheis
120-9			{ [Δ]άμων ἐγ Μυρρί- νούττης	Aigeis
119-8			{ [Τ]ήλεφος 'Οτρυνε[ύς]	Pandionis
118-7			{ Διονύσιος Παιανιεύς	Pandionis
117-6			{ [Στ]ασεύς Κολωνῆθεν	Leontis
116-5			{ [Ζωίλ]ος Φλυεύς	Ptolemais
115-4 Nausias			{ Στρατόδαμος Θορικός	Akamantis
114-3			{ Διονύσιος Σφήττιος	Akamantis
			{ Γάιος Γαῖον 'Αχαρνεύς	Oineis
			{ 'Αριστίων Μελιτεύς	Kekropis
113-2			{ Νικόστρατος Πειραι- εύς καὶ Καλλ' Ἰστράτος 'Εροι- άους	Hippothontis

<i>Tribe</i>	<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Priest of Serapis</i>	<i>Tribe</i>
	112-1			Σέλευκος 'Ραμνούσιος	Aiantis
	111-0			Δημήτριος 'Αναφλύ- στιος	Antiochis
	110-9	Polykleitos		Σωσίων Οίναϊος	Attalis
Hippothontis	109-8	Jason	'Επιφάνης 'Επι- φάνου Λαμ- πρεύς	'Α ..... Κηφισιεύς (Gen.)	Erechtheis
Aiantis	108-7				Aigeis
Antiochis	107-6				Pandionis
Attalis	106-5				Leontis
Erechtheis	105-4	Menoites		'Ιππώνικο[ς] 'Ιππο]νίκ- ου Φλυεύς	Ptolemais
Aigeis	104-3	Serapion	Σοφοκ[λ]ῆς Δη- μη[τρίου]ν 'Ιφι- στιάδης		Akamantis
Leontis					
Ptolemais					
Akamantis					

XI

	<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Tribe</i>
Hippothontis	33-2	Diodoros			
Aiantis	32-1	Lysandros	Γάϊος Γαῖου 'Αλαϊεύς	II Add., 489b.	8 Kekropis
	31-0	Lysiades			
Antiochis	29-9	Demetrios			
Attalis	29-8	Demochares	-- ι]στοκλέους 'Απολ- λωνιεύς	IV 2, 489c.	12 Attalis
	28-7	....il...			

This evidence is conclusive. In all these groups except the last (XI), the tribes of the secretaries follow one another in the official order. Group V is the only one in which one might challenge the disposition of the archons. If one does, he can cut it out altogether: he certainly cannot advance any arguments for a different disposition. All the other groups, except VIII, agree in their arrangement with that given in the Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyc. In regard to VIII, Koehler's authority for the reading of C.I.A. III, 1014, seemed decisive. The dates to which these groups belong can also be assigned in a general sort of way. They are as follows:

I, 303-2 B.C.	V, 242-1 B.C.	IX, 119-8 B.C.
II, 290-89 B.C.	VI, 188-7 B.C.	X, 137-6 to 104-3 B.C.
III, 283-2 B.C.	VII, 169-8 B.C.	
IV, 275-4 B.C.	VIII, 129-8 B.C.	XI, 33-2 B.C.

It will be seen that I-X are distributed with considerable regularity over the third and second centuries before Christ. Of these groups, X is the only one that requires explanation. The list of names at the right hand side is copied without alteration from *Bulletin* xvii (1893), p. 146f. It contains the names of Athenian priests of Serapis for the island of Delos. It is to be noticed, though it was not noticed by the editor, that the priests follow one another in the official order of the tribes to which they belong. If there were two priests for one year, they were both chosen from the same tribe. (See 137-6 B.C., 120-19 B.C., 116-5 B.C. and especially 113-2 B.C.). Just as the official order distributed the secretaryship among the tribes, so it distributed the priesthood. But the analogy is closer still; for in any given year the priest of Serapis and the secretary came from the same tribe. This is shown by three correspondences:

1 (125-4 B.C. and 124-3 B.C.). Nikias and Isigenes are shown by C.I.A. III, 1014 and Bull. xvi, (1892) p. 152, to have been joint archons for the year immediately following that of Jason. The secretary for Jason's year belonged to the ninth tribe, Hippothontis (C.I.A. II, 460). Therefore, since the secretary for the next year but one after that of Nikias and Isigenes belonged to the twelfth tribe, Attalis (C.I.A. III, 1014 and II, 471, lines 1 and 6), it is certain that the secretary for Nikias and Isigenes' archonship belonged to the tenth tribe, *Aiantis*. Now, from an inscription published in *Ἀθῆν.* II, p. 134, and quoted by Homolle in Bull. x, (1886) p. 17, n. 1, we find that the priest of Serapis for the year of Nikias and Isigenes' archonship was *Δημήτριος Ἐρμισίου Μαραθώνιος* of the tribe *Aiantis*.

2 (109-8 B.C.). The secretary who held office for the archon year of Jason *μετὰ Πολύκλειτον* was *Ἐπιφάνης Ἐπιφάνου Λαμπρεύς* of the tribe *Erechtheis* (C.I.A. II, 461). The priest of Serapis for the same year was 'A..... *Κηφισιεύς* (Gen.) of the tribe *Erechtheis* (Bull. vi, (1882) p. 323).

3 (105-4 and 104-3 B.C.). It is shown by C.I.A. II, 465, lines 28 and 33 that Serapion followed immediately after Menoites in the archonship. Therefore, the secretary for Serapion's archonship being *Σοφο[κλ]ῆς Δημη[τρίου] Ἰφιστιάδης* of the sixth tribe, Akaman-

tis, the secretary for Menoites' year must have belonged to the fifth tribe, *Ptolemais*. Bull. VII, (1883) p. 368, shows that the priest of Serapis for the same year was Ἰππόνικο[ς] Ἰππ[ο]νίκου Φλευῆς of the tribe *Ptolemais*.

Now, since we have seen that the tribes in the priesthood followed the official order for the whole period, and that in three different years well distributed over the period the tribe of the priest and the tribe of the secretary coincided, it follows directly that the tribes in the secretaryship for the whole period also followed the official order, and coincided with the tribes in the priesthood throughout. Therefore, as a period for which the official order of the tribes in the secretaryship can be demonstrated, we may set down the 34 years between 138-7 B.C. and 104-3 B.C.

The statement of the conclusions arrived at by a consideration of groups I-X is, **that, wherever during the 200 years between 304-3 B.C. and 104-3 B.C. we can determine the order of the secretaries, that order is the official order of the tribes to which they belong.**

A consideration of group XI will add a clause to this statement. It is obvious at once that, at the time to which this group belongs, a time customarily fixed at about 30 B.C., the tribes of the secretaries no longer followed the official order. Therefore, our new clause is: **and that, when next after 104-3 B.C., or rather, as will appear later, after 96-5 B.C., i. e., in 30 B.C., we can determine the order of the secretaries, that order is not the official order.**

Groups I-X—i. e., the periods during which we can determine the official order of the tribes in the secretaryship—being so numerous and so well distributed over the 200 years under consideration, there is a *prima facie* probability that the official order remained unbroken throughout the whole period. That probability I purpose to make a certainty by using the following list of secretaries and archons disposed upon the assumption that it was a certainty.



## SECRETARIES AND ARCHONS DURING THIRD AND SECOND CENTURIES B.C.

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribes
307-6	Anaxikrates	Λυσίας [Ν]οβ[ι]ππου Διομεύς	II Nov. Add., 320b, Add., 345b. IV 2, 240b.	Aigeis <sup>1</sup>
306-5	Korobios	Πάμφιλος Θεογείσιος Ψαμμοίστος	II, 247.	Aiantis
305-4	Euxenippos	.....ος Λύκου Ἀλωπεκῆθε[ν]	II Add., 252b. IV 2, 252c.	Antiochis
304-3	Pherekles	Ἐπιχαρίνος Δημοχάρους Γαργήτιος	II Add. Nov., 256b. II, 255-257.	Antigonis
303-2	Leostratos	Διόφαντος Διονυσιοδώρου Φηγοίσιος	II, 259-264.	Erechtheis
302-1	Nikokles	Νίκων Θεοδώρου Παλωθείς	II, 269, 270.	Aigeis
301-0	Klearchos	Μνήσαρχ[ος] .....ου Προβαλίστιος	IV 2, 271b.	Pandionis
300-9	Hegemachos	Θεόφιλος [Ξεν]ο[φών]τος Κεφαλῶθεν	II, 297.	Leontis
299-8	Euktemon			Akamantis
298-7	Mnesidemios			Oineis
297-6	Antiphates	[Αντ]ι[κρ]ιάτης Κρατίν[ου] Ἀζην[ος] [εὐς]	II, 299.	Kekropis
296-5	Nikias			Hippothontis
295-4	Nikostratos			Aiantis
294-3	Olympiodoros <sup>2</sup>			Antiochis
293-2	Philippos			Antigonis
292-1	Lysias			Demetrias
291-0	Kimon			Erechtheis
290-9	Diokles	Ξενοφῶ[ν] Ν[ικέων] Ἀλαϊεύς	IV 2, 309b, c.	Aigeis
289-8	Diotimos	Λυσίστρατος [Α]ριστο[μ]έχων Πατιανεύς	II, 311, 312.	Pandionis
288-7	Isaios			Leontis

<sup>1</sup> In 322-1 B.C. Erechtheis gave the secretary; Aigeis catches it up in 307-6 B.C. Why Aiantis succeeds I cannot imagine. Why Demetrias is omitted after Antigonis is equally inexplicable.

<sup>2</sup> The reading - φῶ[ρον Μ] [ε[λ]ι]τ[ε] [εὐς] ? of C.I.A. II, 302 A. Wilhelm, after a careful examination of the stone, pronounces "unmöglich."

<i>Year B.C.</i>	<i>Archon</i>	<i>Name and Deme of Secretary</i>	<i>References</i>	<i>Tribe</i>
287-6	Euthios	Ναυσιμένης Ναυσικίδου Χολοργεύς	II, 314. IV 2, 314c.	Akamantis
286-5	Xenophon <sup>1</sup>	Εὐξένος Καλλίου Αἰζωνεύς	IV 2, 345c.	Oineis
285-4	Ourtos	.....	IV 2, 318c, Add., 318c.	Kekropis
284-3	Telokles	Θεόδωρος Δυσίβλου [Τρικω]σίτος	II, 315.	Hippothontis
283-2	Menekles	Ἰσοκράτης Ἰσοκράτου Ἀλωπεκῆθεν	II, 316, 317.	Aiantis
282-1	Nikias Otr.	..... Ἰ Αἰθαλίδης	IV 2, 331b.	Antiochis
281-0	Aristonymos	Εὐθουνο[ς.... κ]ρίτου [Μυρσί]νοσίτας	II, 305. IV 2, 305b.	Antigonis
280-9	Gorgias	Χαιρεφῶν Ἀρχεστράτου Κεφαλῆθεν	II, 322, 323.	Demetrias
279-8	Anaxikrates	Φαινύλος Πανφύλου Ὀῖθεν	IV 2, 323b.	Erechtheis
278-7	Demokles	Θεόδωτος Θεοφύλου Κεραϊάδης	II Nov. Add., 352b.	Aigeis
277-6	Glaukippus ?	Φορυσκίδης Ἀριστομένου Ἀ[λωπεκῆθεν] <sup>2</sup>	II, 334.	Pandionis
276-5		Ἠγήσιππος Ἀριστομάχου Μελιτεῖς	II, 278. IV 2, 331c.	Leontis
275-4	Polyeuktos			Akamantis
274-3	Hieron			Oineis
273-2				Kekropis
272-1	Diogeiton ?			Hippothontis
271-0	Pytharatos			Aiantis
270-9	Diomedon ?			Antiochis
269-8				Antigonis
268-7	Philokrates			Demetrias
267-6	Peithidemos ?			Erechtheis
266-5				Aigeis

<sup>1</sup> It is possible to place Xenophon in 284-3 B.C., and Telokles in 286-5 B.C.

<sup>2</sup> Ἀ[μακωνεύς] (Hippothontis) is the only other deme name that fills the lacuna here. The position of Diomedon is very uncertain.

<sup>1</sup> In 322-1 B.C. Erechtheis gave the secretary; Aigeis catches it up in 307-6 B.C. Why Aiantis succeeds I cannot imagine. Why Demetrias is omitted after Antigonis is equally inexplicable.

<sup>2</sup> The reading - φ[ου Μ]ε[λ]ι[τε]ς of C.I.A. II, 302 A. Wilhelm, after a careful examination of the stone, pronounces "unmöglich."

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe
265-4	Diognetos	- ο[ς] .....]ος Παμνο[στος]	IV 2, 345b.	Pandionis
264-3				Leontis
263-2				Akamantis
262-1				Oineis
261-0	O(lbios)	.....ος Δημητρί[ο]υ Ἰπποτ[ο]μ[ά]δης ? — — — — — ἐκ Κ[ηδῶν]	II, 330. II, 390.	Kekropis
260-9				Hippothontis
259-8				Atantis
258-7				Antiochis
257-6	- mon	Χαιρ[ε] γένης [Χαι]ργένου Μυρμινοῖστος Ἀ[φ]θόντος Ἀρχίνου Κήριος	II, 303, 304. II, 336.	Antigonis
256-5				Demetrias
255-4				Erechtheis
254-3				Aigeis
253-2	Antimachos	Εὐβουλος Εὐβουλιδ[ου Κοπρεῖος]	II, 391. cf. II, 996.	Pandionis
252-1				Leontis
251-0				Akamantis
250-9				Oineis
249-8	Proxenides?	[Καλ]ίας Καλλιᾶδον Ἰωθεύς	II, 306, 307.	Kekropis
248-7				Hippothontis
247-6				Atantis
246-5				Antiochis
245-4	Kallimedes	Διόδωτος Διογνήτου Φρεαρίπιος	II, 307, 308. IV 2, 307b, c.	Antigonis
244-3				Demetrias
243-2				Erechtheis
242-1				Aigeis
241-0	Thersilochos			Pandionis
240-9				Leontis

Erechtheis  
Aigeis  
Pandionis  
Leontis

[Καλ]ίας Καλλιᾶδος· Ιωθεύς  
Διόδοτος Διογνήτου Φρεάριος

242-1 Kallimedes  
241-0  
240-9 Thersilochos

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe
239-8				Akamantis
238-7	.....(?) ?	.....[ ]ωνος 'Επικηφίας	IV 2, 373c.	Oineis
237-6	Heliodoros	Χαρίας Καλλίου 'Αθμοει[ ]ς	IV 2, 385b.	Kekropis
236-5	Leochares			Hippothontis
235-4	Theophilos	Φίλιππος Κηφισοδώρου 'Α[φιδναίος]	IV 2, 381b.	Aiantis
234-3	Ergochares	Ζωΐλος Διφιλο[ ] 'Αλωπει[ ]θεν	II, 381.	Antiochis
233-2	Niketes			Antigonis
232-1	Antiphilos			Demetrias
231-0				Erechtheis
230-9	Kalli.....			Aigeis
229-8	Menekrates			Pandionis
228-7	Chairephon ?			Leontis
227-6				Ptolemais
226-5	Kallaischros ?			Akamantis
225-4				Oineis
224-3	-s			Kekropis
223-2	Diokles	'Αριστοφάνης Στρατοκλέους Κεiriάδης	IV 2, 385d. II, 399.	Hippothontis
222-1	Euphiletos	Διονυσ - - -		Aiantis
221-0	Herakleitos	Μόσχος Μο[σχ-] Κο[δα]θηρ(αεύς)	IV 2, 385e.	Antiochis
220-9	Archelaos		II, 431.	Antigonis
219-8	Aischron ?			Demetrias
218-7				Erechtheis
217-6				Aigeis
216-5				Pandionis
215-4				Leontis
214-3				Ptolemais

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe
213-2				Akamantis
222-1				Oineis
211-0				Kekropis
210-9				Hippothontis
209-8				Aiantis
208-7				Antiochis
207-6	Thrasylphon	- - του Πασιανεύς	II, 403.	Antigonis
206-5		-ς Μενεστράτου Λαμπτρέύς <sup>1</sup>	II, 385.	Demetrias
205-4				Erechtheis
204-3				Aigeis
203-2				Pandionis
202-1				Leontis
201-0				Ptolemais
200-9				Akamantis
199-8				Oineis
198-7				Kekropis
197-6				Hippothontis
196-5				Aiantis
195-4				Antiochis
194-3				Attalis
193-2				Erechtheis
192-1				Aigeis
191-0		? Φιλ[ - Πασιανεύς	II, 437. cf. IV 2, 420b.	Pandionis
190-9				Leontis

<sup>1</sup> May belong to the following year.

191-0	? Φαλ[ - Παυ]νεύς	II, 437. cf. IV 2, 420b.	Pandionis Leontis
190-9			

<sup>1</sup> May belong to the following year.

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe
189-8	το]υς (Gen.)	? - ο]δήμου [Α]λ[γ]αλειός	IV 2, 407k.	Ptolemais
188-7	Symmachos	Ἀρχικλῆς Θεοδωρου Θοράκιος	II, 416, 417. IV 2, 417b, c.	Akamantis
187-6	Theoxenos			Oineis
186-5	Zopyros	Μεγάμστος Πύρρου Αἰξωνε[ύ]ς	II, 420.	Kekropis
185-4	Eupolemos	Στρατονίκος Στρατονίκε[ον] Ἀμαξ[αντε]ύς	II, 439, 440. IV 2, 439b.	Hippothontis
184-3				Aiantis
183-2	Hermogenes			Antiochis
182-1	Timesianax	- Ἀρ[ιστομάχου] Προβαλίστιος	II, 432.	Attalis
181-0				Erechtheis
180-9				Aigeis
179-8				Pandionis
178-7				Leontis
177-6				Ptolemais
176-5	Hippakos			Akamantis
175-4	Sonikos		II, 435.	Oineis
174-3		Πανσανίας Βιωνέλου Περιβαλίδης		Kekropis
173-2				Hippothontis
172-1				Aiantis
171-0				Antiochis
170-9				Attalis
169-8	Eunikos	Ἰερώνυμ[ος] Βορέβου Κρηφισαίς	IV 2, 441b, 441c.	Erechtheis
168-7	Xenokles	Σθενέδημος Ἀσκ(λ)ητιάδου Τεθράσιος	IV 2, 441d.	Aigeis
167-6				Pandionis
166-5				Leontis
165-4				Ptolemais
164-3	Euergetes...			Akamantis

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe
163-2	Erastos			Oineis
162-1	Poseidonios			Kekropis
161-0	Aristolas	.....ς Φυλωνίδου 'Ελευσίνιος	Mithl. 1896, p. 434f.	Hippothontis
160-9	Tychandros	Σωσιγ[έ]νης Μενεκράτου Μαρ[αθώνιος] <sup>1</sup>	II, 436.	Aiantis
159-8	De.....			Antiochis
158-7	Anthesterios	?		Attalis
157-6	Kallistratos	Ἀγωνίδης Ἀπατου[ρίου]ν [Περγασήθεν]	II, 406. cf. II, 809a, l. 14.	Erechtheis
156-5	Mnesitheos			Aigeis
155-4				Pandionis
154-3				Leontis
153-2	Pelops	Διονυσικλῆς Διονυσίου Ἐκαλῆθεν	IV 2, 477c.	Ptolemais
152-1	Hagnotheos	Μενεκράτης Χαριξείνου Θορίκιος	II, 458. IV 2, 458c.	Akamantis
151-0				Oineis
150-9				Kekropis
149-8				Hippothontis
148-7				Aiantis
147-6				Antiochis
146-5				Attalis
145-4				Erechtheis
144-3				Aigeis
143-2				Pandionis
142-1	Theaitetos			Leontis
141-0		? - - B]οντάδης	II, 421.	Ptolemais
140-9	Antitheos	? - - *E]ρμείος	II, 454.	Akamantis

<sup>1</sup> May belong to 172-1 B.C.

<sup>1</sup> May belong to 172-1 B.C.

Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe
139-8	Archon			Oineis
138-7	Epikrates	..... Στυλίου	Bull. XIII, p. 414.	Kekropis
137-6				Hippothontis
136-5				Alantis
135-4				Antiochis
134-3				Attalis
133-2	Metrophanes	'Επύγνης Μοσχίου Δαμπτρέις		Erechtheis
132-1	Ergokles		II, 408.	Aigeis
131-0	Epikles	[Γοργ]λος Γοργύλου—	II, 459.	Pandionis
130-9		? - - - άκου Εύρυπιδης	IV 2, 451b.	Leontis
129-8	Lykistios			Ptolemais
128-7	Dionysios			Akamantis
127-6	Theodorides			Oineis
126-5	Diotimos			Kekropis
125-4	Jason			Hippothontis
124-3	Nikias and Isigenes	- 'Αναξικράτου 'Ελευσίνιος	II, 460.	Alantis
123-2	Demetrios			Antiochis
122-1	Nikodemios			Attalis
121-0	Eugamos <sup>1</sup>	'Επύγνης 'Επυγίου Οινάιος		Erechtheis
120-9		? - - - δό]τον Διομε[ύς]	II, 471, 472. IV 2, 472b.	Aigeis
119-8	Aristarchos	Τελέστης Μηδείον Παυανείς	II, 462.	Pandionis
118-7	Agathokles	Εύκλῆς Ξεανόρου Αἰθα[λίου]	II, 470, l. 64 and 73. II, 470, l. 1 and 31.	Leontis

<sup>1</sup> The tenth year after the death of Kameades, the son of Polemarchos.



Year B.C.	Archon	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe
117-6	Herakleides <sup>1</sup>			Ptolemais
116-5	Sosikrates			Akamantis
115-4	Nausias			Oineis
114-3				Kekropis
113-2	Paranomos			Hippothontis
112-1	Dionysios			Aiantis
111-0		Δάμιος Τιμόνχου Ὑαμνούνσιος	II, 475.	Antiochis
110-9	Polykleitos			Attalis
109-8	Jason	Ἐπιφάνης Ἐπιφάνου Λαμπιτρέως	II, 461.	Erechtheis
108-7	Demochares	? - Διονυσιοδώρου Ἀγκυλ[ῆθεν]	IV 2, 477d.	Aigeis
107-6	Hipparchos			Pandionis
106-5	Lenaïos	[Ἰ]σίδωρος Ἀπο[λλ]ωνίου Σκαμβωνίδης	II, 469, l. 1 and 49.	Leontis
105-4	Menoites			Ptolemais
104-3	Serapion	Σοφο[κλ]ῆς Δημη[τρίου] Ἰφιστιάδης	II, 465, l. 28.	Akamantis
103-2	Theokles <sup>2</sup>	- σ[θέν]ης Κλευνίου Κοθωκί[δης]	IV 2, 477.	Oineis
102-1	Echekrates			Kekropis
101-0	Medeios	Φιλίων Φιλίωνος Ἐλευσίνιος	II, 467, l. 1 and 66.	Hippothontis
100-9	Theodosios			Aiantis
99-8	Prokles			Antiochis
98-7	Argeios			Attalis
97-6	Argeios			Erechtheis
96-5	Herakleitos			Aigeis

<sup>1</sup> Or Herakleides.<sup>2</sup> The archon n. placed in 116-5 B.C., and Sosikrates in 117-6 B.C. is supplied in the Corpus. There is no reason why it should be.

To complete the list of secretaries, I give the following names which have not as yet been assigned to any particular year.

## UNDATED SECRETARIES.

Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Archon
- ερσ[.....ρ]ας -	II, 310.	- r]os
- Βου]λαγόρ[ου -	II, 342.	
- νο[ς] 'Ιπ[πο]κ[ρίτων -	II, 344.	
- 'Αρισ]τ[ο.]ή[ο.]ν -	II, 345.	
Σώστατο[ς] 'Α[ρι]στ -	II, 371.	Thymochares
- έν]ους Εί[- δης]	IV 2, 371c.	
Ποτάμων Δόν[ακος] -	II, 372.	Hagnias
Προκ[λ]ήης 'Απ - -	II, 373.	Theophemos
'Αριστόμαχος 'Αριστο -	II Nov. Add., 373b.	Lysiades
[Θε]οδόσιος Ξενοφά[ν] - -	II, 377.	
Προκλήης Περι - -	II, 392.	- μετὰ Phanarchides
Κεφάλος Κεφάλων [-η]ς	II, 407.	
Νικ[άν]ωρ - -	IV 2, 407b.	
- ων Ν. - -	IV 2, 409b.	
Θεόλυτος [- - θ]εν	II, 418.	Dionysios
'Ιάσων 'Αριστοκ[ρ] - -	IV 2, 418b.	Dionysios
- ω]ν 'Αγνοθέου -	II, 430, 495.	
'Ηρακλέων Ναν - -	II, 433.	Achaios
Ευάνδρος - -	IV 2, 463c.	Phokion

The dates of Group I, for which see p. 44, are fixed positively by the lists of archons given by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus and the Parian Chronicle. We are certain, therefore, that in the year 303-2 B.C. the tribe which furnished the secretary was Erechtheis. The list on the right hand side contains the tribes disposed in the official order with Erechtheis in 303-2 B.C. as a starting point. In constructing this list it is assumed that it was in 229-8 B.C. or thereabouts, that the tribe Ptolemais was added to the twelve previously existing, and given the seventh place in the official order between Leontis and Akamantis. This date, 229-8 B.C., is the one for which there is most<sup>1</sup> evidence. It is also assumed that it was in 200 B.C. that the tribes Antigonis and Demetrias were dropped and the tribe Attalis

<sup>1</sup>For best treatment of this point see the dissertation of Mr. F. O. Bates, cited at p. 43 above.

added, and given the twelfth, or last place, in the official order. This date is sufficiently attested by Livy and Polybius to be quite certain. With the official order of the tribes in the secretaryship demonstrated for so many groups of years between 304-3 B.C. and 104-3 B.C., it would be strong testimony to its unbroken continuation throughout, if the events, recorded in the inscriptions which give us the secretaries, as dated upon the supposition that the official order *was* unbroken, agreed in their chronological sequence with the narratives of them found in the works of the later Greek historians. This agreement we have throughout. But we have stronger testimony still; for in four widely separated years we can show that the secretary, who held office for each of these years, did, as a matter of fact, belong to the tribe postulated for that year by an unbroken official order. These four years are:

(1) 268-7 B.C.

(2) 168-7 B.C.

(3) 125-4 B.C.

(4) 97-6 B.C.

(1) According to a notice prefixed to a fragment of Antigonos of Karystos, the philosopher Polemon died in the archonship of Philokrates (E[rwin] R[ohde], *Literarisches Centralblatt*, 1882, p. 58). The original Greek version of Eusebius' *Χρονικά*, and the Latin translation of them by Hieronymus, agree in assigning the death of Polemon to the year 268-7 B.C. (Vol. II, p. 120 and 121, ed. A. Schoene, 1866). The secretary for the year of Philokrates archonship was Ἡγήσιππος Ἀριστομάχου Μελιτεὺς (C.I.A. IV 2, 331c.) of the tribe *Demetrias*. It will be seen from the list of tribes that the official order demands a secretary from *Demetrias* for the year 268-7 B.C.

(2) In the papyrus rolls from Herculaneum, Col. XXVII (Phil. Suppl. II, 1863, p. 543, quoted by Dumont, *Fastes Éponymiques d'Athènes*, p. 18), we read:

Ἀγαμήστωρ δὲ μετὰ τὴν Περσέως [Ξλ]ωσιν Αἰ. as υἱὸς ὃν Πολυξένου ἐπὶ Ξενοκλέους τὴν ἀπόλυσιν τοῦ βίου ἐποιήσατο.

The battle of Pydna was fought on the Roman<sup>1</sup> 4th of Sept., or on the 22nd of June, of the Julian calendar, in the year 168 B.C. (Mommsen, *History of Rome*, Vol. II, p. 355), and Per-

<sup>1</sup>This date is determined by an eclipse of the sun.

seus was captured a short time afterwards. This would be in the Attic year 168-7 B.C., and surely the Greek quoted above means nothing, if not that Xenokles was archon in that year. The secretary for the year of Xenokles' archonship was *Σθενέδημος* 'Ασκ(λ)ηπιάδου *Τειθράσιος* of the tribe *Aigeis* (C.I.A. IV 2, 441d.) According to the unbroken official order *Aigeis* should have the secretaryship in 168-7 B.C.

(3) Phlegon of Tralles (*Mirabilia X*; *Rerum Naturalium Scriptores*, ed. Keller I, p. 75 f.) says :

'Εγενήθη καὶ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης ἀνδρόγυνος, ἄρχοντος Ἀθήνησιν Ἰάσονος, ὑπατευνότων ἐν Ῥώμῃ Μάρκου Πλα(υ)τίου καὶ Λουκίου Κανινίου ... Ὑψαίου καὶ Μάρκου Φουλβίου Φλάκκου.

According to Mommsen (C.I.L. I, p. 534 f.), the consuls for the year<sup>1</sup> 125-4 B.C. were, M. Plautius Hypsaesus and M. Fulvius Flaccus, and those for the year 2-1 B.C., Octavius Augustus and M. Plautius Silvanus (C.I.L. I, p. 548 f.). As *suffecti* to the last mentioned pair Baiter, *Fasti Consulares*, p. LX sq. (Cic. *Op.* ed. Orelli Vol. VIII), adds Q. Fabricius and L. Caninius Gallus. As Keller (*praefatio*, p. LXV), says : "*neglegentioris librarii ab illo M. Plautio ad hunc alterum aberrasse videantur.*"

The secretary for the year of Jason's archonship was - Ἀναξικράτου Ἐλευσίνιος (C.I.A. II, 460) of the tribe *Hippothontis*. This tribe an unbroken official order demands for the year 125-4 B.C.

(4) There is published in Bull. IV, (1880) p. 190, the following Delian inscription :

Ἑρμαῖσταί, Ἀπολλωνιασταί, Ποσειδωνιασταί, οἱ γενόμενοι ἐπὶ ὑπάτων Γναίου Κορνηλίου Λεντόλου καὶ Ποπλίου Λικινίου Κράσσου. ἐπὶ ἐπιμελητοῦ δὲ τῆς νήσου Μηδείου τοῦ Μηδείου Πειραιέως, τὸν Ἑρακλῆν ἀνέθηκαν, ἀφιερώσαντες Ἑρακλεῖ καὶ Ἰταλικοῖς.

Cn. Cornelius Lentulus and P. Licinius Crassus were consuls at Rome in the year 97-6 B.C. (Mommsen C.I.L. I, p. 537). Evidently Medeios was epimeletes of Delos in the same year. Now,

<sup>1</sup> I have followed Mommsen here rather than Baiter, who puts M. Plautius Hypsaesus and M. Fulvius Flaccus in 126-5 B.C.; for Mommsen's calculations were made 25 years later, in 1863, and are based upon more complete evidence. Schoeffer, Dumont, Homolle, Meier and others follow Mommsen likewise. 125-4 B.C. is, I think, to be ascribed with certainty to Jason.

Medeios was epimeletes of Delos twice, once under the first archonship of Argeios (C.I.A. II, 985D, l. 13 and 14), and again under the second archonship of Argeios in the following year. On this point Homolle (Bull. IV, (1880) p. 191, n. 2), says:

<sup>1</sup> "L'année suivante, sous le deuxième archontat d'Argeios, il remplit les mêmes fonctions; mais il s'agit évidemment ici de la première ἐπιμέλεια, puisque 'on n'a pas écrit ἐπιμελητοῦ τὸ δεύτερον.'"

This objection to the second ἐπιμέλεια will not hold; for in C.I.A. II, 985D, l. 30, there is no τὸ δεύτερον added to distinguish the second archonship of Argeios.

The secretary for the *archonship* of Medeios, between which and the second archonship of Argeios there fell three years, was Φιλίων Φιλίωνος Ἐλευσίνιος, of the tribe Hippothontis (C.I.A. II, 467). The secretary for Argeios' second year, therefore, belonged to the tribe *Erechtheis*, and this is the tribe required for 97-6 B.C. by an unbroken official order from 304-3 B.C. on.

The coincidence between the tribe postulated for the secretary by the unbroken continuation of the official order, and the tribe which the inscriptions show to have held the secretaryship, in any one of the four years, would alone be sufficient, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to make the unbroken continuation of the official order all but certain. No uncertainty whatsoever remains when all four are considered together; for, although there might be a difference of opinion as to whether Xenokles, Jason and the second Argeios belonged to the years 168-7 B.C., 125-4 B.C., and 97-6 B.C., or to 167-6 B.C., 126-5 B.C., and 96-5 B.C. respectively, yet, when we string the three years on the official order of their tribes (which official order groups VII, VIII, IX, and X given above demonstrate), the intervals between the figures of each set of years make the former set alone possible. For instance, if Jason were put in 126-5 B.C., as Baiter supposed, Xenokles would have to be put in 169-8 B.C. But in Xenokles' archonship, Perseus King of Macedon was made a prisoner by the Romans, an event which did not take

<sup>1</sup> I wish I knew Homolle's authority here. For if the second ἐπιμέλεια of Medeios is not sufficiently vouched for, it might be thought that the official order of the tribes in the secretaryship stopped when that of the tribes in the priesthood of Serapis did, somewhere between 104-3 B.C. and 101-0 B.C. (see C.I.A. II, 985E, l. 57).

place till after the battle of Pydna in the early part of the Attic year 168-7 B.C. Xenokles, therefore, could not have belonged to the year 169-8 B.C., nor Jason to the year 126-5 B.C.

§ 14. Γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν. Γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου. Περὶ τὸ βῆμα.

It is perfectly evident that the persons said in the preambles of decrees to have been secretaries were, during the third and second centuries, as during the fourth, all holders of one and the same ἀρχή. This the official order of their tribes proves. It is equally as evident that the person, said in the preamble to have been secretary, is identical with the secretary who had the decree published; for the only object sought in putting his name in the preamble was to certify that the publication was made by him and was therefore official. When, therefore, we find mentioned two different titles in connection with the publication of decrees it must be that they both belong to the same official.

For these and other reasons, the conclusion was reached that γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς and γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν were different in title only. The same reasons prove that γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν and γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου were titles for one and the same official; for, just as in the period between 358-6 B.C. or 354-2 B.C. and 318-7 B.C., we find the officer who had the decrees published called, in one decree γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, and in another γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς, so, in the period between 307-6 B.C. and 237-6 B.C. (omitting C.I.A. II, 415, and IV 2, 535d as uncertain), we find the officer who posted up the decrees given, now the title γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, and again γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου, while all the time the names given in the preamble followed the official order of their tribes.

Of the inscriptions which have γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου, the following belong to the latter part of the fourth or the beginning of the third century: C.I.A. II, 273, 275, 282, 286, 293, 310, 367, 368?, 530; IV 2, 296e, 318c, frg. b., l. 15, 374c, 513b, and 513i; the following are dated, (Plut.), Lives of the Ten Orators, p. 852E, in Anaxikrates' archonship 307-6 B.C., C.I.A. IV 2, 345c, l. 34 in Ourios'

archonship 285-4 B.C., C.I.A. II, 334 in Diomedon's archonship 270-9 B.C., Diog. Laert., VII 10f. in Arrheneides' archonship 263-2 to 261-0 B.C.?, and C.I.A. IV 2, 385c, l. 28 in Heliodoros' archonship 237-6 B.C.; and the following are very doubtfully dated, C.I.A. II, 415, circa 197 B.C., and C.I.A. IV 2, 535d (where γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου should be read) 'τῶν πρὸ Χριστοῦ ῥωμαϊκῶν χρόνων'.

The two decrees which purport to be published by the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου are C.I.A. II, 146 (356-336 B.C.), and C.I.A. II, 309 (post 290-89 B.C.).

Koehler has restored the former thus:

[τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τ]ῆς βουλῆς [καὶ τοῦ δήμου? ἀναγράψα]ι τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐστὶν λιθίνε]ι.

Instead of this Schaefer, De scribis senatus populique Atheniensium, p. 35f., suggests:

[τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τ]ῆς βουλῆς [ἐν ἀκροπόλει ἀναγράψα]ι τόδε τὸ ψήφισμα κτλ.

C.I.A. II, 309 appears in the Corpus thus:

[ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὸ ψήφισμα]ι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς β[ουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου καὶ στ]ῆσαι ἐν ἀκ[ρ]οπόλει, εἰ[ς δὲ τὴν πόλιν τῆς στήλης μερίσαι] τοῦ[ς] ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησ[ει τὸ ἀνάλωμα].

If τῆς β[ουλῆς] is correct, I think the following reading preferable, though by no means certain: [ον δικαστ]ήριον κατὰ τοὺς νόμο[υς] '[ἀναγράψαι δὲ τόδε] τὸ ψήφισμα]ι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς β[ουλῆς ἐν στήλῃ] [λιθί, νη καὶ στῆσ]αι ἐν ἀκροπόλει ' εἰ[ς δὲ τὴν πόλιν τῆς στήλ ης] [μερίσαι] τοῦ[ς] ἐπὶ τῇ διοίκησ[ει τὸ ἀνάλωμα].

This has the merits at least of supplying two important parts of the formula, τόδε, and ἐν στήλῃ λιθίνῃ, and of making the last three complete lines of equal length, as is usual in στοιχηδόν inscriptions of this time. As printed in the Corpus, the lengths range all the way from line 15, which has 35 letters, to line 35, with 42. The new readings promised by A. Wilhelm will probably change the restorations materially. Whatever the correct readings in C.I.A. II, 146 and 309 may be, it is safe to say that they are not those of the Corpus; for these identify the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου with the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς, γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου or γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν, as he is differently named, and this is impossible.

In only one case is the title *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου* found except in connection with the publication of decrees. This is in C.I.A. II, 329 (273-1? B.C.). Here among the officers of a prytany and of the senate commended by the *δῆμος* is included the *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου*, Neoptolemos. In several other decrees of the same character such as C.I.A. II, 393 and 394 (post 229-8 B.C.), 431, l. 45 (220-9 B.C.), and 441—the title found is *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου* (see § 16). It is possible that *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου* is but an abbreviated form of this title. In that case Neoptolemos had nothing to do with the publication of decrees, and could under no circumstances have had the title *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* applied to him. As analogous variations from the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου*, we may cite in A. Wilhelm, Bericht, p. 6f *γραμματεὺς τῷ δήμῳ*, in C.I.A. II, 865 (circa 380 B.C.), *γραμματεὺς τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ* and in C.I.A. IV 2, 872b (probably a little later), III, 1038 (circa 175 A.D.), III, 1045 (circa 180 A.D.), *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς*. These facts merely indicate that, except in stereotyped formulae, the title of a secretary was not rigidly fixed. It may be, on the other hand, that the *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου* mentioned in C.I.A. II, 329, is the one more commonly designated *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*. In this case, he is, of course, different from the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου* found in C.I.A. II, 393, 394, 431, and 441.

From the time the title *γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου* disappears, the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* continues to be alone connected with the publication of decrees. Elsewhere, this same officer is found among the lists of the *ἀΐσιτοι*, or annual officers. He is given his stereotyped title *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* in two of these lists only (C.I.A. III, 1030 and 1038). In the rest, all of which belong to the latter part of the second, or the beginning of the third century after Christ (C.I.A. III, 10, 1020, 1029, 1031, 1032, 1034, 1040, 1041, 1042, 1048, 1051, 1064, and 1073), the same officer is called *περὶ τὸ βῆμα*. This probably was the title by which he was popularly known at that time. The identity of the person called *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* and *περὶ τὸ βῆμα* is shown, (1) by the fact that in the lists of the *ἀΐσιτοι*, when one appears, the other is absent, and (2) by C.I.A. III, 10 (209-10 A.D.), where in the pre-



amble of the decree, 'Ρόδων Καλλίστου Μαραθώνιος is said to have been secretary, while in the list of annual officers, *ἀτίτοι*, posted at the end of the decree, he is designated *περὶ τὸ βῆμα*.

§ 15. Γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους.

The secretary who comes second in the treatment of Aristotle may have had this title. His duties were much the same in regard to the *νόμοι*, as were those of the *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν* in regard to the *ψηφίσματα*. The *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, however, had to have certain of the *ψηφίσματα* inscribed on stone, whereas none of the *νόμοι* were so treated. It is, indeed, entirely owing to the fact that so many of the *ψηφίσματα* have come down to us in this way, that we are able to add to the knowledge concerning their curator which we derive from Aristotle. Had we as many laws, we might be able to do the same for the *γραμματεὺς ἐπὶ τοὺς νόμους*; as we have none, we are obliged to content ourselves with what Aristotle tells us.

§ 16. Γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου.

This is a title found, with one exception, only in the class of inscriptions called by Koehler '*catalogi prytanum*'. Of these *catalogi* there are three sets:

(1) Those of the first set belong to the fourth century B.C., and were inscribed upon offerings dedicated by the prytanes in return for honors awarded them by the senate and people. At the end of the list of prytanes, the name of the *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου* is frequently, though not invariably, given. Of these names we have the following:

C.I.A. II, 865 (early part of 4th cent.). Pandionis.

[γραμ]ματεὺς τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ

. . . Λείδης Φιλοθήρου ἐξ Οὔου.

C.I.A. II, 867 (378-7 B.C.). Akamantis.

-- ἐγ[ραμ][μ]άτευεν τῇ βουλῇ[ι καὶ τῷ δήμῳ].

C.I.A. II, 869 (middle of 4th cent.). Antiochis.

γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου

Προνάπης Προξένου Προσπάλτιος.

C.I.A. II, 870 (middle of 4th cent.). Aigeis.

γρ[α]μματεὺς [τῆ] βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ  
[Βλ.]έπυρος? Πειθάνδρου Παιονίδης.

C.I.A. IV 2, 871b (middle of 4th cent.). Pandionis.

γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου  
Δῶρος Σμικύθου Μελιτεύς.

C.I.A. IV 2, 872b (undated). Leontis.

γραμμ[ατεὺς] βουλῆς  
Ἀντιμένης Ἀ[λ]ωπεκῆ[θεν].

Excepting the officials chosen from among the prytanes themselves (*e.g.*, ταμίας τῆς φυλῆς, συλλογείς, ἱεροποιοί), the [ἀντι]γραφεὺς (C.I.A. II, 865), and the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου are the only officers mentioned in these lists. The ἀντιγραφεὺς held office for a year (Aeschin. III, 25).

(2) The inscriptions of the second set are distributed over the third and second centuries before Christ. In them, the lists of the prytanes and officers are attached to the decrees of the senate and people in which they are commended. Besides the names of the prytany officers (*e.g.*, ταμίας, γραμματεὺς, ἱερεὺς τοῦ ἐπωνύμου), there are given those of some of the state officers, such as ὁ ταμίας τῆς βουλῆς, ὁ κήρυξ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου, ὁ ὑπογραμματεὺς, and among them, the γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου. Of the latter there are found the following :

C.I.A. II, 393 (post 229-8 B.C.).

[ὁ γραμματεὺς] τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου  
Σώσιππος - - - - εὐς.

C.I.A. II, 394 (post 229-8 B.C.). Hippothontis.

[ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου]  
Φανο - - - - .

C.I.A. II, 431, l. 45 (220-9 B.C.). Leontis.

[ὁ γραμμ]ατ[εὺς τῆς] βουλ[ῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου]  
- - - - .

C.I.A. II, 441 (undated).

ὁ γραμματεὺς [τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου]  
- - - - .

For C.I.A. II, 329 see above p. 65.

(3) The inscriptions of the third set belong to the second century after Christ. In them, along with the names of the prytanes and their officers, appear those of the *ἀσῖται*, and among the latter, in the following inscriptions, is found the *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου*: C.I.A. III, 1029 (167-8 A.D.), 1030 (168-9, A.D.), 1031 (169-70 A.D.), 1032 (170-1 A.D.), 1034 (170-1 A.D.), 1040 (183-4 A.D.), 1041 (185-8 A.D.), 1042, 1044, and 1048. Instead of *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου*, in C.I.A. III, 1038 (175? A.D.) and 1045, is found the abbreviated title *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς*. There can be no doubt as to the identity of the two.

The one inscription in which the title *γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου* occurs, outside of the '*catalogi prytanum*', is C.I.A. II, 488 (about 30 B.C.). Here, at the end of a decree, is read: [τοῦτο τὸ ψήφισμα --- ἐν Μυρί]νῃ ὁ ἐπὶ τ[οὺς ὀπλείτας στρατηγὸς καὶ ὁ κ]ήρυξ [τῆς ἐ]ξ Ἀρείου πάγου βο[υλῆς καὶ ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς] βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου. What they are to do with the *ψήφισμα* is not known.

It is, therefore, apparent that there existed at Athens, during the fourth, third, second, and first centuries before Christ, and during the second century after Christ, an official called *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου*. Was the *ἀρχή* held by the persons denoted by this title the same during the whole period? There can be no reasonable doubt that it was. If so, it is evident that it was an annual office. After Christ it certainly was; otherwise, the name of its holder would not appear among those of the *ἀσῖται*. Now, among the *ἀσῖται* there is found the name of no officer, who in the last four centuries before Christ is known to have held office for the time of one prytany only. Any that were prytany officers in earlier times, *e.g.*, *γραμματεὺς βουλευτῶν*, are mentioned among the prytanes themselves. On the other hand, among the *ἀσῖται* are found several officers, who in the centuries before Christ were yearly magistrates, *e.g.*, *γραμματεὺς κατὰ πρυτανείαν*, *ἀντιγραφεὺς*. These facts go to show that prytany offices remained prytany offices, and annual offices remained annual offices throughout this whole period. The inference may therefore be drawn that, during the fourth century, B.C., the *γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου* was an annual magistrate. Hence, at the time Aristotle wrote the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*, there existed at Athens a yearly secretary with

that name. The γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου must, therefore, be one of the three described by him. He is clearly not the first. The second had the laws under his care and had nothing whatever to do with the prytanes. He can only be the third, the one of whom Aristotle says (Ath. Pol. 54, 5): χειροτονεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ δῆμος γραμματεῖα τὸν ἀναγνώσκοντα αὐτῷ (i.e. τῷ δήμῳ) καὶ τῇ βουλῇ, καὶ οὗτος οὐδενός ἐστι κύριος ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ ἀναγνῶναι.

Why then is his name found in the 4th century 'catalogi prytanum'? The same question must be asked in the case of the ἀντιγραφεὺς. The ἀντιγραφεὺς presented to the people, at the end of each prytany, the accounts of the money received and expended by the prytanes. The γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου read to the people, at the request of the presiding prytanes, all documents such as προβουλεύματα, ψηφίσματα, etc. What is there surprising in the presence of their names among those of the prytanes adjudged to have acquitted themselves best during the year? Their reports and attainments would, no doubt, have done much to secure the honours for the prytanes in question. It is noteworthy, in this connection, that the γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου was chosen by popular election, not by lot. Not every citizen could make his voice heard throughout the ekklesia, and the δῆμος must at least hear the proposals of the prytanes.

When the secretary under consideration is bidden to read a document, he is usually called simply ὁ γραμματεὺς (C.I.A. II, 114A, l. 9f., Aeschin. III, 100, Dem. XX, p. 485, Thucyd. VII, 10, where the τῆς πόλεως is bracketed by Herwerden, Stahl and Hude, Sandys Ath. Pol., Ch. 54, 5n.). In (Plut.) Lycurg. 841F he is called γραμματεὺς τῆς πόλεως. In A. Wilhelm, Bericht, p. 6f. he is called γραμματεὺς τῷ δήμῳ, an abridgement of what in C.I.A. II, 865, 867, and 870, we find as γραμματεὺς τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ. So in C.I.A. II, 329, γραμματεὺς βουλῆς καὶ δήμου is perhaps abbreviated to γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου, and in C.I.A. IV 2, 872b, III, 1038. and 1045, to γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς. The probability is that he had no fixed title at all, but was most commonly called γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου. The uniqueness of his duties would distinguish him sufficiently in any case.

These duties were to read letters, new laws, psephismata, probouleumata and other documents of all kinds to the senate and assembly. Οὗτος οὐδενός ἐστι κύριος ἀλλ' ἢ τοῦ ἀναγνῶναι, says Aristotle. His name is, therefore, wrongly restored in C.I.A. II, 146, and 309, and he is wrongly identified with the γραμματεὺς τοῦ δήμου found in the inscriptions cited above, p. 63f. ; for he was not the officer who attended to the publication of decrees.

§ 17. Γραμματεὺς πρυτάνεων. Γραμματεὺς βουλευτῶν.

In the '*catalogi prytanum*' of the second set, there is mentioned a secretary with the title γραμματεὺς πρυτάνεων. In those of the first set, this name is wanting. The presumption is that he did not exist in the fourth century. In the three following centuries he was a member of the presiding prytany (C.I.A. II, 329). It is unlikely that he was elected by lot. His associate, the ταμίης, certainly was not (C.I.A. II, 431). His duties were τὰς θυσίας θύειν πάσας τὰς καθηκούσας ἐν τῇ πρυτανείᾳ ὑπὲρ τε τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου· ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων (C.I.A. II, 431).

In the third set of '*catalogi prytanum*', an official corresponding to the γραμματεὺς πρυτάνεων, but with the title γραμματεὺς βουλευτῶν, appears. There can be no reasonable doubt that he is the same. He is still a prytany officer, and is not registered among the αἵσιτοι.

§ 18. Γραμματεὺς τῶν ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ. Γραμματεὺς τῶν ταμιῶν τῆς θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν.

For the period 434-3 to 407-6 B.C. inclusive, we have a tolerably complete list of the secretaries of the treasurers of Athens. It is as follows :

Year B.C.	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe of Secretary
434-3	Κράτης Ναύτωνος Λαμπρῆς	I, 117, 118, 142, 179.	Erechtheis
433-2	Εὐθίας Ἀσχρόνος Ἀναφλιπτίας	I, 141, 142, 162, 179.	Antiochis
432-1	[A]πολλόδορος Κριτίων Ἀφιδναῖος	I, 119, 120, 142, 162, 163.	Aiantis
431-0	Διόγυς Ἰσαίδρου Περαιεῖς	I, 119, 120, 163, 164.	Hippothontis
430-9	Θέολλος Χαιμιάδου Φλυεῖς	I, 120, 121, 122, 148.	Kekropis
429-8	Μελρσίας Πολυκλέους Ὀαεῖς	I, 121, 122, 123, 148.	Pandionis
428-7	Μεγακλῆς Μεγακλέους Ἀλσπεκτεῖς	I, 122, 123, 124, 148, 149, 150.	Antiochis
427-6	Εὐβουλος Φιλογέστονος Ἀχαρνεῖς	I, 123, 124, 129, 149, 150.	Oineis
426-5	Κρητισοφών Κρητισοδώρου Ἑρμειος	I, 129, 130, 150.	Akamantis
425-4	Λυσίστρατος [s M]ορηχίδου Παλληνεῖς	I, 129, 130, 131.	Antiochis
424-3	Σμείνυθος	I, 130, 132.	
423-2	Τελέστης Θεογνίδος Ἀγλ[οῖστος]	I, 131, 132.	
422-1	Προσβίας Σημίον Φηγαῖος	I, 132, 153, 170, 171. IV 1, 154, p. 28.	{ Aigeis Pandionis
421-0	Νικεύς Εὐθι[κλέους] Ἀλμοῖ[στος]	I, 154, 155, 170, 171.	Leontis
420-9	Ἐπιγένης Ἀσ[α]νδρου Αἰγλειεῖς	I, 154, 155, 171, 320.	Antiochis
419-8	Ἀσιόδικος . . . . . ον Γ[αρ]γύρ[τιος]	I, 155, 156. IV 1, 155, 156, p. 28.	Aigeis
418-7	Φορμίων Ἀριστίωνος Κιδαθηραῖος	I, 125, 126, 156, 157, 158, 173, 180.	Pandionis
417-6	Εὐξενος Εὐφάνιος Προσπάλτιος	I, 125, 126, 127, 157, 158, 181.	Akamantis
416-5	Ἀσικλῆς Δρακοτίδου Βυτήθεν	I, 126, 127, 128, 158, 159, 182.	Aigeis
415-4	[T]ελέυς Τελενίκου Περιματῆθεν	I, 127, 128, 159, 183.	Erechtheis
414-3	Πολυ[μ]ήδης Κηφισίωνος Ἀττηνῆς	I, 133, 134, 151, 165, 166.	Antiochis
413-2	Λευκαῖος Κοιμάρχου Ἀφιδναῖος	I, 134, 135, 152, 165, 167.	Aiantis
412-1	Αὐτοκλειδῆς Σωτράτου Φρεάρβιος	I, 134, 135, 166, 167.	Leontis
411-0	..... ἰωνος Εὐνορμειεῖς	I, 135, 136.	Erechtheis
410-9	.....		
409-8	.....		
408-7	..... ὀχάρου Ἐλεοντίος	I, 138. IV 1, 160a, p. 29.	Hippothontis
407-6	..... Εὐ[θ]ίου Λευκοναῖος	I, 139. IV 1, 160a, p. 29. I, 140. IV 1, 160a, p. 29.	Leontis

During two periods, 434-3 to 430-29 B.C. inclusive, and 416-5 to 413-2 B.C. inclusive, the tribes of the secretaries follow one another in the reverse of their official order.

For the next number of years, the treasury boards of Athena and of the Other Gods were united, and had a secretary in common. Of these secretaries the following remain :

Year B.C.	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe of Secretary
406-5			*Akamantis
405-4			*Leontis
404-3			*Pandionis
403-2	- - as Κολλυτεύς	IV 2, 642b.	Aigeis
402-1	Κλείσοφος Εύων[υμεύς]	II, 642 <sup>1</sup> .	Erechtheis
401-0			*Antiochis
400-9	Θερσί[λο]χος Οιναιῶς	II, 643, 645.	Aiantis
399-8	Χαιρ[ί]ων Ἐλευσίνιος	II, 644, 652. IV 2, 645b, 653.	Hippothontis
398-7	Μνησίερος Ἀθμονεύ[ς]	II, 652, 653. IV 2, 653.	Kekropis
397-6	Μόρυχος Βουτάδης	II, 652. IV 2, 653.	Oineis
396-5			*Akamantis
395-4			*Leontis
394-3			*Pandionis
393-2			*Aigeis
392-1			*Erechtheis
391-0			*Antiochis
390-9	- - ρης Ἀφιδναῖος	II, 660.	Aiantis
389-8			*Hippothontis
388-7			*Kekropis
387-6			*Oineis

For the period 403-2 to 390-89 B.C. at the very least, the tribes of the secretaries follow one another in the reverse of the official order, and it is probable that it was of twenty years duration so as to complete two sets of tribe rotations. The date, at which the beginning of the twenty year period must be fixed, lies between 407-6 B.C. and 403-2 B.C. 406-5 B.C., the first of a Panathenaic Penteteris, is *prima facie* the most probable year; for, as we are dealing with the secretary of the joint board of treasurers, twenty years, starting from 385-4 B.C., the first year<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This inscription is now dated precisely.

<sup>2</sup> See C.I.A. II, 667.

in which we know that the union of the boards no longer existed, take us at once beyond 403-2 B.C. Indeed, 406-5 B.C. is the year assigned by Hans Lehner (*Über die athenischen Schatzverzeichnisse des vierten Jahrhunderts.* Bonn, 1880, p. 12 ff.) and by Paul Pauske (*De magistratibus Atticis qui saeculo a. Chr. n. quarto pecunias publicas curabant.* Leipz. Stud. XIII, 1890, p. 4 ff.) for the consolidation of the boards. The evidence for this date is: that C.I.A. IV 2, 642b compels us to assume that the boards were already joined in 404-3 B.C.; that Andocides, *De Myst.* 77 refers to a joint board in 405-4 B.C.; that the treasurers of Athens for the year 407-6 B.C. do not, as usual, name their successors; that, at the end of the year 407-6 B.C., of the gold and silver offerings cared for by the treasurers of Athena, all kept in the Pronaos, and many of those kept in the Parthenon and Hekatompedon, were handed over to the Hellenotamiai to meet the expenses incurred in fitting out the fleet to fight at Arginousai; that the Old Temple of Athena, in the Opisthodomos of which were stored the precious things cared for by the treasurers of the Other Gods, was burnt down in the early part of the year; that what remained of the offerings after the fire, was put, with what was left of Athena's treasures, in the Hekatompedon; that the treasurers both of Athena and of the Other Gods, at the end of their term of office in the early part of 406-5 B.C., were lying in prison on a charge, of negligence we may suppose, in connection with the burning of the temple. When the treasures were for the great part gone, and when those that remained were all stored in one room, it is not surprising that a single board of caretakers was thought sufficient.

So, when the construction of the Long Walls, in 393 B.C., and the peace of Antalkidas, in 387-6 B.C., brought commercial prosperity to Athens, and Thrasyboulos, in 390-89 B.C., won back tribute-paying dependencies for the city, the administration of the finances would demand a board of treasurers to replace the Hellenotamiai. Moreover, upon the rebuilding of the Old Temple of Athena, alluded to by Aristophanes in *Plutus* 1191 ff. (388 B.C.), a board of treasurers would be required to care for the money, and gold and silver offerings again undoubtedly stored



there. It is not surprising that 387-6 B.C., being the last year of a Panathenaic Penteteris, and the last in the second set of tribe rotations, ended the period of the joint board of treasurers and of the reverse of the official order of the secretaries' tribes.

After 387-6 B.C. came a period, we know not of what length, in which, neither the reverse of the official order, nor the official order itself, guided the tribes in their turns to the secretaryship of the treasurers of Athena. This is indicated by the tribe of the secretary for 376-5 B.C., *Εὐθίας Πεισίων Κήτριος*, of the tribe Leontis (C.I.A. II, 670, 671). In the year 351-0 B.C., however, as the following list shows, we encounter a new system.

Year B.C.	Name and Deme of Secretary	References	Tribe of Secretary
351-0	Ἀγάθουμος Ἀδειμάντου Θυμαϊτά(δης)	II, 698.	Hippothontis
350-9			*Aiantis
349-8	Πιστιδῆς Θοραμεύς	II, 698.	Antiochis
348-7			*Erechtheis
347-6			*Aigeis
346-5			*Pandionis
345-4			*Leontis
344-3			*Akamantis
343-2			*Oineis
342-1			*Kekropis
341-0	- - μαχών Ἐλευσίν(ιος)	II, 703.	Hippothontis
340-9	- - κ]ράτους Τρικορύ- σι(ος)	II, 703.	Aiantis

For the years 351-0 to 340-39 B.C. inclusive, the secretaries' tribes follow, not the reverse of the official order as before, but the official order itself. When this system was introduced, and how long it lasted, we cannot even conjecture. The treasury boards in the latter part of the fourth century B.C. lost much of their former importance, owing to the vestment of supreme financial authority in the persons of new officers. Consequently, the boards are rarely met with in inscriptions of this period, and after 340-39 B.C. we are unable to give the deme of a single secretary.

I have no comment to make on the *γραμματεὺς Ἑλληνοταμιῶν* or the *γραμματεὺς τῶν ταμιῶν τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν*. The official order cannot be shown to have had anything to do with the distribution of either of these officers among the tribes. The tribe of the *γραμματεὺς εὐσμοθέων* can in no case be determined.

## APPENDIX A.

### THE TRIBES WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE DEMES.

#### *Erechtheis.*

Agryle, Anagyrous, Euonymon, Kedoi, Kephisia, Lamptrae, Pambotadai, Pergase, Phegous, Sybridai, Themakos.

#### *Aigeis.*

Ankyle, Araphen, Bate, Diomeia, Erchia, Erikeia, Gargettos, Halai Araphenides, Hestiaia, Ikaria, Ionidai, Kollytos, Kolonos, Kydantidai, Myrrhinoutta, Otryne, Phegaia, Philaidai, Plotheia, Teithras.

#### *Pandionis.*

Angele, Graes, Kaletea, Konthyle, Kydathenaion, Kytheros, Myrrhinous, Oa, Paiania, Phegaia, Prasiai, Probalinthos, Steiria.

#### *Leontis.*

Aithalidai, Cholleidai, Deiradiotai, Eupyridai, Halimous, Hekale, Hybadai, Kettos, Kolone, Kropidai, Leukonoe, Oion, Kerameikon, Paionidai, Pelekes, Phrearrhoi, Potamos, Skambonidai, Sounion.

#### *Alamantis.*

Cholargos, Eiresidai, Eitea, Hagnous, Hermos, Iphistiadai, Kephale, Kerameikos, Kikynna, Kyrteidai, Poros, Prospalta, Rhakidai, Sphettos, Thorikos.

#### *Oineis.*

Acharnai, Boutadai, Epikephisioi, Hippotomadai, Kothokidai, Lakiadai, Lousia, Oe, Perithoidai, Phyle, Ptelea, Thria, Tyrmeidai.

#### *Kekropis.*

Aixone, Athmonon, Daidalidai, Epieikidai, Halai Aixonikai, Melite, Phlya, Pithos, Sypalettos, Trinemeia, Xypete.

*Hippothontis.*

Acherdous, Amymone, Anakaia, Auridai, Azenia, Dekeleia, Elaious, Eleusis, Eroiadai, Hamaxanteia, Keiriadai, Koile, Koprois, Korydallos, Oinoe, Oion Dekeleikon, Peiraieus, Pol—, Sphendale, Thymaitadai.

*Aiantis.*

Aphidna, Kykala, Marathon, Oinoe, Perrhidai, Phaleron, (Psaphis), Rhamnous, Thyrgonidai, Titakidai, Trikorynthos.

*Antiochis.*

Aigilia, Alopeke, Amphitrope, Anaphlystos, Atene, Besa, Eitea, Ergadeis, Eroiadai, Kolone, Krioa, Lekkon, Leukopyra, (Melainai), Pallene, (Pentele), Phyrhinesioi, Semachidai, Thorai.

*Antigonis.*

<sup>1</sup>\*Agryle, Aithalidai, Deiradiotai?, Eitea, Gargettos, Ikaria, Kydathenaion, \*Lamptrai, \*Paiania.

*Demetrias.*

Atene, Hippotomadai, Koile, Kothokidai, Melite, Thorai, Xypete.

*Ptolemais.*

Aigilia, Akyia, Aphidna, Berenikidai, Boutadai, Eunostidai, Hekale, Hyporeia, Ikaria, Klo —, Kolone, Konthyle, Kydanti-dai?, Melainai, Oinoe, Pentele, Perrhidai, Petaliai, Phlya, Pros-palta, \*Semachidai, Themakos, Thyrgonidai, Titakidai.

*Attalis.*

Agryle, Ankyle?, Apollonieis, Atene, Athmonon, Hagnous, Korydallos, Oinoe, Oion Dekeleikon, Probalinthos, Sounion, Tyrmeidai.

<sup>1</sup> The star signifies that the deme had two parts, one of which remained in the old tribe. That none but divided demes could belong to two tribes at the same time, has been shown by Mr. F. O. Bates in the dissertation cited at p. 43 above.

## APPENDIX B.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY.

**Bates, F. O.** The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes, (Cornell University dissertation).

**Beloch, Julius.** Die Errichtung der Phyle Ptolemais. Neue Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 129 (1884), p. 481 ff.

**Boeckh, August.** Staatshaushaltung der Athener. Vol. I (1850), p. 251 ff.

**Busolt, Georg.** Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer. I. Müller, Handbuch IV 1, p. 254 ff.

**Caillemer, E.** Article *Grammateis*, in Daremberg et Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités Vol. II (1896), p. 1646 ff.

**Dittenberger, Wilhelm.** Attische Archonten zwischen Ol. 122 und 130. Hermes II (1867), p. 285 ff.

**Dittenberger, Wilhelm.** Untersuchungen über die nach Kleisthenes neu errichteten attischen Phylen. Hermes 9 (1875), p. 385 ff.

**Dörpfeld, Wilhelm.** Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis. Mitth. XI (1886), p. 337 ff. ; XII (1887), p. 25 ff. and p. 190 ff.

**Drerup, Engelbert.** Über den Staatsschreiber von Athen. Philologisch-historische Beiträge für Curt Wachsmuth (1897), p. 137 ff.

**Dumont, A.** Essai sur la chronologie des archontes athéniens postérieurs à la CXXII<sup>e</sup> Olymp. Paris, (1870).

**Dumont, A.** Fastes éponymiques d'Athènes. Paris, (1874).

**Dumont, A.** Supplément à la chronologie des archontes athéniens postérieurs à la CXXII<sup>me</sup> Olymp. Bull. I (1877), p. 36 ff.

**Fränkel, Max.** Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener von August Boeckh (1886), Vol. I, p. 226 ff.

**Gardner, Percy, and Jevons, Frank Byron.** A Manual of Greek Antiquities (1895), p. 485 f.

**Gilbert, Gustav.** Der athenische Rathsschreiber. *Philologus* 39 (1880), p. 131 ff.

**Gilbert, Gustav.** The Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens. English Translation (1895), p. <sup>2</sup>268 ff.

**Goodwin, W. W.** The Relation of the *πρόεδροι* to the *πρωτάεις* in the Athenian Senate. *Trans. Amer. Phil. Ass.* XVI (1885), p. 165 ff.

**Gow, James.** A Companion to School Classics. (1893), p. <sup>3</sup>117.

**Hartel, Wilhelm.** Studien über attisches Staatsrecht und Urkundenwesen. Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, philosoph.-hist. Klasse, 90 (1878), p. 543 ff.; 91 (1878), p. 101 ff. and especially p. 135 ff.

**Headlam, J. W.** Election by Lot at Athens. Cambridge University Press (1891).

**Heisterbergk, B.** Die Bestellung der Beamten durch das Los. *Berliner Studien* XVI 5 (1896), p. 1 ff.

**Hille, Carolus Antonius.** De scribis Atheniensium publicis. *Leipz. Stud.* I (1878), p. 203 ff.

**Homolle, Th.** Supplément à la chronologie des archontes athéniens postérieurs à la CXXII<sup>m</sup> Olymp. *Bull.* IV (1880), p. 182 ff.

**Homolle, Th.** Note sur la chronologie des archontes athéniens de la seconde moitié du II<sup>m</sup> siècle av. J. C. *Bull.* X (1886), p. 6 ff.

**Homolle, Th.** Remarques sur la chronologie de quelques archontes athéniens. *Bull.* XVII (1893), p. 145 ff.

**Kirchner, Joh. E.** Die Zusammensetzung der Phylen Antigonis und Demetrias. *Rheinisches Museum* 47 (1892), p. 550 ff.

**Koehler, W.** Studien zu den attischen Psephismen. *Hermes* V (1871), p. 328 ff.

**Kornitzer, A.** De scribis publicis Atheniensium. *Wien-Hernals* (1883). Progr.

**Lehner, Hans.** Über die athenischen Schatzverzeichnisse des vierten Jahrhunderts. Bonn (1890).

**Lipsius, J. H.** Griechische Alterthümer von G. F. Schoemann I (1897), p. 403 f.

**Milchhoefer, A.** Untersuchungen über die Demenordnung des Kleisthenes. Berlin (1892).

**Milchhoefer, A.** Article *Attika*, in Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie, Vol. II (1896), p. 2184 ff.

**Meier, M. H. E.** Index Atticorum archontum eponymorum qui post Olymp. CXXI, 2 eum magistratum obtinuerunt, emendatior et auctior. Commentatio epigraphica secunda. Halis (1854), p. 79 ff.

**Mommsen A.** Die zehn Eponymen und die Reihenfolge der nach ihnen benannten Phylen Athens. Philologus 47 (1888), p. 449 ff.

**Neubauer, Ricardus.** Commentationes Epigraphicae. Bero-  
lini (1869), p. 155 ff.

**Panske, Paul.** De magistratibus Atticis qui saeculo a. Chr. n. quarto pecunias publicas curabant. Leipz. Stud. XIII (1890), p. 1 ff.

**Penndorf, Julius.** De scribis reipublicae Atheniensium. Leipz. Stud. XVIII (1897), p. 101 ff.

**Sandys, John Edwin.** Aristotle's Constitution of Athens (1893), Ch. 54, 3-5, notes.

**Schaefer, Carolus.** De scribis senatus populiue Atheniensium. Gryphiswaldiae (1878).

**Schmidt, Adolf.** Chronologische Fragmente. Neue Jahrbücher für classische Philologie 129 (1884), p. 649 ff.

**S(chmitz), L(eonard).** Article *Grammateus*, in Smith's Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, Vol. I (1882), p. 577f.

**Schoeffer, V.von.** Article *Archontes*, in Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie, Vol. II (1896), p. 565 ff.

**Schtschoukareff, Alexandre.** Archontes athéniens du III<sup>me</sup> siècle. Bull. XII (1888), p. 69 ff.

**Seyffert, Oskar.** Article *Grammateus*, in Dictionary of Classical Antiquities. English Translation (1891), p. 259f.

**Sidgwick, H.** Conjectures on the Constitutional History of Athens, 594-580 B.C. Class. Rev. VIII (1894), p. 333 ff.

**Stojentin, Fedor von.** Die γραμματεῖς und der ἀντιγραφεὺς des Rathes bei Pollux und Harpokration. Jahrbücher für classische Philologie; Fleckeisen, 121 (1880), p. 189 ff.

**Thalheim, Th.** Article 'Ἀντιγραφεὺς, in Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopädie Vol. I (1894), p. 2423f.

**Thumser, Viktor.** Lehrbuch der griechischen Staatsaltertümer von Karl Friedrich Hermann. Freiburg (1889) 2<sup>e</sup> Abteilung § 87b [127], p. 497 ff.

**Unger, G. F.** Die attischen Archonten von ol. 119, 4. 301–123, 4. 285 v. Chr. Philologus 38 (1878), p. 423 ff.

**Unger, G. F.** Attische Archonten 292–260 v. Chr. Philologus Suppl. V (1889), p. 627 ff.

**Usener, H.** Chronologische Beiträge. Rheinisches Museum 34 (1879), p. 388 ff.

**Wachsmuth, Curt.** Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum II 1 (1890), p. 339 f.

**Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von.** Antigonos von Karystos. Philologische Untersuchungen IV (1881). Excursus I, Die philosophenschulen und die politik: chronologische Beilage, p. 235 ff.

**Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von.** Γραμματεὺς τῆς πόλεως. Hermes 14 (1878), p. 148 ff.

**Wilhelm, A.** Bericht. (Reprint apparently from the Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, philosoph.-hist. Klasse, dated Dec. 9, 1897).

**Wilhelm, A. and Krispi, Michael K.** Ein neues Bruchstück der parischen Marmorchronik. Mitth. XXII (1897), p. 183 ff.

**Wilhelm, A.** Michel, Recueil d'inscriptions grecques. Fasc. I et II. Gött. gel. Anz. 160 (1898), p. 201 ff.

**Wyse, W.** Class. Rev. V (1891), p. 275 f.

## The Macmillan Company's New Books on Greek Antiquities, etc.

### The History of Greece.

From its Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation.

By ADOLF HOLM. In four volumes. Price per set, \$10.00 net. Just ready.

Vol. I. Up to the end of the Sixth Century, B. C. Vol. II. The Fifth Century, B. C. Vol. III. The Fourth Century, B. C., Up to the Death of Alexander. Vol. IV. The Græco-Macedonian Age, from the Death of Alexander to the Incorporation of the last Macedonian Monarchy in the Roman Empire.

"A succinct account of Greek history indispensable to all students and teachers of Greek history who respect their work."—*The Nation*.

"As a store of information brought up to date with indefatigable industry and conscientious fidelity, the work is invaluable."—*The Evening Telegraph*, Phila.

### A Hand-Book of Greek Sculpture.

By ERNEST A. GARDNER, formerly Director of The British School of Archaeology at Athens. In one volume. Cloth. Price, \$2.50. For greater convenience the First Part issued more than a year ago, and the Second Part only recently published, are bound in one, but those who already have the first volume can purchase the second separately if preferred at \$1.25.

A reviewer in *The Nation* comments:—"It is concise, yet thoroughly readable, and its half-tone illustrations are uniformly good. In this book we have for the first time in English a thoroughly competent history of Greek sculpture. It is a pleasure to be able to recommend almost without qualification a book on a subject which has been much at the mercy of the incompetent and the reckless."

### Pausanias's Description of Greece.

Translated with a Commentary by J. G. FRAZER, M.A., LL.D., (Glasgow), Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. In six volumes. 8vo. Price \$25.00 net. Illustrated with about Thirty Maps and Plans, Four Photogravure Plates, and over Two Hundred Engravings in the Text.

The work is divided as follows:—Vol. I. Introduction, Translation, Critical Notes on the Greek Text. Vol. II. Commentary on Book I. (Attica.) Vol. III. Commentary on Books II-V. (Argolis, Laconia, Messenia, Elis I.) Vol. IV. Commentary on Books VI-VIII. (Elis II., Achaia, Arcadia.) Vol. V. Commentary on Books IX, X. (Boeotia, Phocis.) Addenda. Vol. VI. Indices. Maps. *The volumes are not sold separately.*

In this work the aim has been to give, first, a faithful and idiomatic rendering of Pausanias, and second, a Commentary which shall illustrate his description of ancient Greece by the light of modern research. The general purpose has been to present a fairly complete picture of ancient Greece, its monuments and its scenery, so far as that can be done from a study of the descriptions of classical authors, the existing remains of antiquity, and the appearance of the country at the present day.

### The Sculptured Tombs of Hellas.

By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., Professor of Classical Archaeology and Art in the University of Oxford. Imperial 8vo. Cloth. Price \$8.00. With 30 plates and 87 engravings in the text.

From *The Nation*:—"This beautiful book is welcome to all who believe in classical archaeology as a study which may bring into prominence the humanitarian side of classical studies. It is equally serviceable for the general reader and for the scholar, since it deals competently with the whole subject in hand, without being voluminous. Of its 259 pages, nearly fifty are occupied by the engravings in the text, which are a wonderfully complete supplement to the thirty well-executed and selected full-page plates. Professor Gardner has successfully studied a brevity which sacrifices nothing essential because it suppresses all labored descriptions of monuments, and depends upon adequate representations of the monuments themselves."

PUBLISHED BY

The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Avenue, New York.



THE  
Cornell Studies in Classical Philology

EDITED BY

BENJAMIN IDE WHEELER, CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT,  
AND GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL

- I. The CUM-Constructions: their history and functions, by  
William Gardner Hale. Part i: Critical, 1887. Part ii:  
Constructive, 1889.

Out of Print

- II. Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language, by  
Benjamin Ide Wheeler, 1887.

Out of Print

- III. The Cult of Asklepios, by Alice Walton, 1894.

Price 80 cts

- IV. The Development of the Athenian Constitution, by George  
Willis Botsford, 1893.

Price \$1.50

- V. Index Antiphonteus: composuit Frank Lovis van Cleef,  
1895.

Price \$1.00

- VI. Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, by Herbert Charles  
Elmer, 1898.

Price \$1.50

- VII. The Athenian Secretaries, by William Scott Ferguson,  
1898.

Price 50 cts

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY

**The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave., New York.**

lology

NETT,

ctions, by  
Part ii :

guage, by

oy George

an Cleef,

t Charles

erguson,

wYork.